

# SPECIAL POLYNOMIALS RELATED TO THE SUPERSYMMETRIC EIGHT-VERTEX MODEL. I. BEHAVIOUR AT CUSPS.

HJALMAR ROSENGREN

**ABSTRACT.** We study certain symmetric polynomials, which as very special cases include polynomials related to the supersymmetric eight-vertex model, and other elliptic lattice models with  $\Delta = \pm 1/2$ . In this paper, which is the first part of a series, we study the behaviour of the polynomials at special parameter values, which can be identified with cusps of the modular group  $\Gamma_0(12)$ . In subsequent papers, we will show that the polynomials satisfy a non-stationary Schrödinger equation related to the Inozemtsev model and that they give a four-dimensional lattice of tau functions of Painlevé VI.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper is the first in a series, devoted to the study of certain special symmetric polynomials. Numerous specializations of these polynomials have appeared in connection with elliptic solvable lattice models, at the special parameter values usually denoted  $\Delta = \pm 1/2$ .

The values  $\Delta = \pm 1/2$  are truly exceptional. One explanation why  $\Delta = -1/2$  is special comes from the limit to the massive sine-Gordon model, when it becomes a condition for supersymmetry [FS]. Recently, Hagendorf and Fendley [HF] implemented this supersymmetry on the finite lattice. Thus, we refer to  $\Delta = -1/2$  as the *supersymmetric* case.

The six-vertex model with  $\Delta = 1/2$  contains the combinatorial ice model, where all states have equal weight. This was used by Kuperberg [Ku] in his simple proof of the alternating sign matrix theorem, which enumerates the states with domain wall boundary conditions. The combinatorics of the XXZ and six-vertex models at  $\Delta = -1/2$  is also very rich, see [Z1] for a survey. It seems quite interesting to extend results in this area to the elliptic regime, but so far only the first steps have been taken.

In [BM1], Bazhanov and Mangazeev found that the ground state eigenvalue of Baxter's  $Q$ -operator for the supersymmetric periodic XYZ chain of odd length can be expressed in terms of certain polynomials, which appear to have positive integer coefficients and thus call for a combinatorial interpretation. In [BM2], it was conjectured that specializations of these polynomials are tau functions of Painlevé VI, constructed from one of Picard's algebraic solutions via a sequence of Bäcklund transformations. The papers [BM3] and [RS] deal with ground state eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian for the same XYZ chain. Certain components of these eigenvectors, as well as certain sums of components, again seem to be

---

Research supported by the Swedish Science Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet).

described by polynomials with positive coefficients. The same polynomials appear for other supersymmetric spin chains [BH, FH, H]. A mathematically rigorous investigation of the supersymmetric XYZ chain was recently initiated by Zinn-Justin [Z2].

As was noted in [BM3], there are striking parallels between the work outlined above and our investigation of the 8VSOS and three-colour models [R2, R3]. Just as the six-vertex model contains the combinatorial ice model when  $\Delta = 1/2$ , the corresponding combinatorial specialization of the 8VSOS model is the three-colour model. Extending Kuperberg's work to the elliptic regime, we expressed the domain wall partition function for the three-colour model in terms of certain special polynomials, which again conjecturally have positive integer coefficients.

In the present paper, we will explain the relations between various polynomials introduced in [BM1, BM3, R3, Z2], by identifying them as special cases of a more general family of functions. We stress that, although the underlying physical models are closely related [B1, B2], it is not clear why objects as different as domain wall partition functions [R2, R3], eigenvalues of the  $Q$ -operator [BM1, BM2] and eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian [BM3, BH, FH, H, RS, Z2] should lead to related special functions.

This first part in our series has a rather technical nature. For each non-negative integer  $m$ , we define a four-dimensional lattice  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  of symmetric rational functions in  $m$  variables, depending also on a parameter  $\zeta$ . (The indices  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$  satisfy  $|\mathbf{k}| + m = 2n$ .) Since the denominator is elementary, and often absent,  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  are essentially symmetric polynomials. One of our main results is Corollary 3.9, which states that  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  never vanishes identically. This is the key for our continued investigations [R4, R5].

Up to a change of variables, which we refer to as *uniformization*,  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  is a theta function with quasi-periods  $(1, \tau)$ . As a function of  $\tau$ , the parameter  $\zeta$  is a Hauptmodul for the modular group  $\Gamma = \Gamma_0(6, 2) \simeq \Gamma_0(12)$ , see §2.8. This group has six cusps. Under the natural action of  $N_{\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})}(\Gamma)/\Gamma \simeq S_3$ , the cusps split into two orbits. We call the three cusps belonging to the orbit of  $\tau = i\infty$  *trigonometric* and the remaining three cusps *non-trigonometric*. Our proof of the fundamental Corollary 3.9 is based on a careful investigation of the behaviour of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  at the trigonometric cusps, see §3. In §4, we make a corresponding investigation of the non-trigonometric cusps. This is technically more difficult and our results are not complete.

In the final §5, we explain the relation between  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  and various polynomials introduced in [BM1, BM3, R3, Z2] and also occurring in [BH, BM2, FH, H, RS]. To be precise, for the polynomials related to eigenvalues of the  $Q$ -operator [BM1] and to domain wall partition functions [R3], these relations are rigorously proved. However, for polynomials related to eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian, the identification with our polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  is still based on empirical observation. A partially rigorous result exists only for the “sum rule” giving the square norm of

the eigenvector, which was recently proved by Zinn-Justin [Z2], assuming a certain conjecture.

In the next paper in the series [R4], we will obtain a non-stationary Schrödinger equation for  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$ . This is in turn applied in [R5], where the case  $m = 0$  of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  is identified with a four-dimensional lattice of tau functions of Painlevé VI. In very special cases, these results reduce to conjectures of Bazhanov and Mangazeev [BM1, BM2]. In future work we plan to explain the connection to affine Lie algebra characters, which was already suggested in [R3], and give further relations to the combinatorics of three-colourings. We hope that this will be useful for understanding the combinatorics of elliptic lattice models at  $\Delta = -1/2$ . The resulting relation between Painlevé tau functions and affine Lie algebra characters should be of independent interest.

**Acknowledgements:** I would like to thank Vladimir Bazhanov, Vladimir Mangazeev and Paul Zinn-Justin for discussions.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Notation.** Throughout the paper,

$$\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}.$$

We fix  $\tau$  in the upper half-plane, and write  $p = e^{\pi i \tau}$ . The four half-periods in  $\mathbb{C}/(\mathbb{Z} + \tau\mathbb{Z})$  will be denoted

$$\gamma_0 = 0, \quad \gamma_1 = \frac{\tau}{2}, \quad \gamma_2 = \frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \gamma_3 = \frac{1}{2}.$$

We will use the notation

$$(x; p)_\infty = \prod_{j=0}^{\infty} (1 - xp^j),$$

$$\theta(x; p) = (x; p)_\infty (p/x; p)_\infty.$$

Repeated variables are used as a short-hand for products; for instance,

$$\theta(a, \pm b; p) = \theta(a; p)\theta(b; p)\theta(-b; p).$$

The theta function satisfies

$$\theta(px; p) = \theta(x^{-1}; p) = -x^{-1}\theta(x; p) \tag{2.1}$$

and the addition formula

$$\theta(az^\pm, bw^\pm; p) - \theta(bz^\pm, aw^\pm; p) = \frac{b}{z} \theta(ab^\pm, zw^\pm; p). \tag{2.2}$$

We introduce the function

$$\psi(z) = p^{\frac{1}{12}}(p^2; p^2)_\infty e^{-\pi i z} \theta(e^{2\pi i z}, \pm p e^{2\pi i z}; p^2),$$

which satisfies

$$\psi(z+1) = \psi(-z) = -\psi(z), \quad \psi(z+\tau) = e^{-3\pi i(\tau+2z)}\psi(z). \tag{2.3a}$$

By the quintuple product identity [W],

$$\psi(z) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left( e^{\frac{1}{12}(6k-1)^2\pi i\tau + (6k-1)\pi iz} - e^{\frac{1}{12}(6k+1)^2\pi i\tau + (6k+1)\pi iz} \right),$$

which implies that

$$\psi(z) = \psi\left(z + \frac{1}{3}\right) + \psi\left(z - \frac{1}{3}\right). \quad (2.3b)$$

**2.2. Spaces of theta functions.** For  $n$  a non-negative integer, we denote by  $\Theta_n$  the space of entire functions  $f$  such that

$$f(z+1) = f(z), \quad f(z+\tau) = e^{-6\pi in(\tau+2z)}f(z), \quad f(-z) = -f(z), \quad (2.4a)$$

$$f(z) + f\left(z + \frac{1}{3}\right) + f\left(z - \frac{1}{3}\right) = 0. \quad (2.4b)$$

For  $n \geq 1$ , the map  $e^{2\pi iz} \mapsto f(z)$  is, in the terminology of [RSc, Def. 3.1], a  $C_{3n-1}$  theta function, subject to the additional constraint (2.4b). By [RSc, Prop. 6.1],  $\dim \Theta_n = 2n$ , an explicit basis being

$$e^{2\pi i(j-3n)z}\theta(-p^{2j}e^{12\pi inz}; p^{12n}) - e^{2\pi i(3n-j)z}\theta(-p^{2j}e^{-12\pi inz}; p^{12n}),$$

where  $1 \leq j \leq 3n-1$  and  $3 \nmid j$ . The space  $\Theta_0$  consists only of the zero function.

**Lemma 2.1.** *The space  $\Theta_n$  is the linear span of all functions of the form*

$$e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}, ae^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)\theta(b_1e^{\pm 6\pi iz}, \dots, b_{n-1}e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $a, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}$  are constants.

*Proof.* Starting from (2.5), we may use (2.2) to express  $\theta(ae^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)$  as a linear combination of  $\theta(\omega e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)$  and  $\theta(-\omega e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)$ . For  $a = \omega$ , (2.5) is a constant times

$$e^{-3\pi iz}\psi\left(z + \frac{1}{2}\right)\theta(e^{6\pi iz}, b_1e^{\pm 6\pi iz}, \dots, b_{n-1}e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6)$$

and for  $a = -\omega$  a constant times

$$e^{-3\pi iz}\psi(z)\theta(-e^{6\pi iz}, b_1e^{\pm 6\pi iz}, \dots, b_{n-1}e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6).$$

Using (2.1) and (2.3) it is straight-forward to check that these functions are in  $\Theta_n$ . To complete the proof, it is enough to find  $2n$  linearly independent functions  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{2n}$  of the form (2.5). For later purposes, it will be convenient to define

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_j(z) &= e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2)\theta(e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{\lfloor \frac{j-1}{2} \rfloor}\theta(\omega e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{j-1} \\ &\quad \times \theta(pe^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{n-\lfloor \frac{j+1}{2} \rfloor}\theta(p\omega e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{2n-j} \\ &= \begin{cases} \omega^{j-2}e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}, \omega e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2) \\ \quad \times \theta(e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6)^{\frac{j-2}{2}}\theta(p^3e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6)^{\frac{2n-j}{2}}, & j \text{ even}, \\ \omega^{j-1}e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}, \omega pe^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2) \\ \quad \times \theta(e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6)^{\frac{j-1}{2}}\theta(p^3e^{\pm 6\pi iz}; p^6)^{\frac{2n-j-1}{2}}, & j \text{ odd}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

which are linearly independent since  $\psi_j$  has a zero of degree exactly  $j - 1$  at  $z = 1/3$ .  $\square$

We introduce the operator

$$(\sigma f)(z) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \left( f\left(z + \frac{1}{3}\right) - f\left(z - \frac{1}{3}\right) \right). \quad (2.7)$$

It is easy to check that  $\sigma$  acts as an involution on the space of one-periodic functions satisfying (2.4b). Moreover,  $\sigma$  preserves the second relation in (2.4a), whereas it interchanges the subspaces of even and odd functions. Thus,  $\sigma$  is a bijection from  $\Theta_n$  to the space of entire functions satisfying (2.4), except that they are even instead of odd.

We will now introduce a generalization of the space  $\Theta_n$ , defined by combining (2.4) with a prescribed behaviour at the lattice

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{Z} + \frac{\tau}{2}\mathbb{Z}. \quad (2.8)$$

It will be convenient to write  $\Lambda_j = \gamma_j + \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{Z} + \tau\mathbb{Z}$ , so that  $\Lambda = \bigcup_{j=0}^3 \Lambda_j$ . To prepare for the definition, consider a meromorphic function  $f$  satisfying (2.4), where  $n$  is no longer assumed positive. Let  $g_j(z) = f(z + \gamma_j)$  if  $j = 0, 3$  and  $g_j(z) = e^{6\pi i n z} f(z + \gamma_j)$  if  $j = 1, 2$ . It is easy to check that the functions  $g_j$  also satisfy (2.4).

Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ , such that  $2n \geq |\mathbf{k}| = \sum_j k_j$ . Throughout, we will write  $m = 2n - |\mathbf{k}|$  and  $k_j^\pm = \max(\pm k_j, 0)$ . We define  $\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}}$  to be the space of functions  $f$  satisfying (2.4), which are analytic except for possible poles at  $\Lambda$ , and such that the Laurent expansion of  $g_j(z)$  at  $z = 1/3$  takes the form

$$g_j\left(z + \frac{1}{3}\right) = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} a_N z^{2N} + \sum_{N=k_j}^{\infty} b_N z^{2N+1}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.9)$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *With  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $n$  as above, let*

$$\Phi(z) = \prod_{j=0}^3 \theta(e^{6\pi i(\gamma_j \pm z)}; p^6)^{k_j^\pm}.$$

*Then,  $f \in \Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}}$  if and only if  $F = f\Phi$  is an element in  $\Theta_{n+|\mathbf{k}^-|}$  satisfying*

$$F'(\gamma_j) = F^{(3)}(\gamma_j) = \dots = F^{(2k_j-1)}(\gamma_j) = 0 \quad (2.10a)$$

*for indices  $j$  such that  $k_j > 0$  and*

$$\sigma F(\gamma_j) = (\sigma F)''(\gamma_j) = \dots = (\sigma F)^{(-2k_j-2)}(\gamma_j) = 0 \quad (2.10b)$$

*for  $j$  such that  $k_j < 0$ .*

*Proof.* It is easy to check that  $f$  satisfies (2.4) if and only if  $F$  satisfies (2.4) with  $n$  replaced by  $n + |\mathbf{k}^-|$ . Thus, it is enough to consider the behaviour at  $\Lambda$ . Note that (2.9) implies

$$g_j(z) = -g_j\left(z + \frac{1}{3}\right) + g_j\left(-z + \frac{1}{3}\right) = -2 \sum_{N=k_j}^{\infty} b_N z^{2N+1}.$$

Thus, if  $k_j \geq 0$ , (2.9) means that  $f$  is analytic at  $\Lambda_j$  and has a zero of degree at least  $2k_j + 1$  at  $z = \gamma_j$ . Since  $g_j$  is odd, it is for the latter property enough to assume the vanishing of the first  $k_j$  odd derivatives. Since  $\Phi$  is even and non-zero at  $\Lambda_j$ , this is in turn equivalent to  $F$  being analytic at  $\Lambda_j$  and satisfying (2.10a).

If  $k_j < 0$ ,  $f$  has poles of degree at most  $-(2k_j + 1)$  at  $\Lambda_j$ ; thus,  $F$  is analytic there. Writing

$$(\sigma g_j)(z) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \left( g_j\left(z + \frac{1}{3}\right) + g_j\left(-z + \frac{1}{3}\right) \right) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} a_N z^{2N},$$

we find as above that (2.9) is equivalent to  $F$  being analytic at  $\Lambda_j$  and satisfying (2.10b).  $\square$

Since  $\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}}$  is obtained by imposing  $\sum_j |k_j| = 2|\mathbf{k}^-| + |\mathbf{k}|$  linear conditions on a space of dimension  $2n + 2|\mathbf{k}^-|$ , its dimension is at least  $2n - |\mathbf{k}| = m$ . In fact, this estimate is sharp.

**Theorem 2.3.** *The space  $\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}}$  has dimension  $m = 2n - |\mathbf{k}|$ .*

Theorem 2.3 is the main result of the present paper, and will be vital for our continued investigations [R4, R5]. It is proved at the end of §3.

**2.3. Elliptic Tsuchiya determinant.** We are interested in the one-dimensional space  $\Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$ . It is spanned by the alternant

$$\det(\psi_j(z_i))_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2n}, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\psi_j$  runs through a basis of  $\Theta_n$ . We will also need another type of determinant formula, which is less symmetric, but has the advantage that any minor of the determinant involved is a determinant of the same form.

**Lemma 2.4.** *The space  $\Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$  is spanned by the function*

$$\prod_{j=1}^{2n} e^{-2\pi i z_j} \theta(e^{4\pi i z_j}; p^2) \prod_{i,j=1}^n e^{-6\pi i z_{n+j}} \theta(e^{6\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_i)}; p^6) \\ \times \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( \frac{e^{-2\pi i z_{n+j}} \theta(e^{2\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_i)}; p^2)}{e^{-6\pi i z_{n+j}} \theta(e^{6\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_i)}; p^6)} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

(When  $n = 0$ , (2.12) should be interpreted as the constant 1, and  $\Theta_0^{\wedge 0}$  as  $\mathbb{C}$ .)

*Proof.* As a function of  $z_1$ , (2.12) is a linear combination of the terms

$$e^{-2\pi i z_1} \theta(e^{4\pi i z_1}; p^2) \theta(e^{2\pi i(z_{n+k} \pm z_1)}) \prod_{j=1, j \neq k}^n \theta(e^{6\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_1)}; p^6),$$

with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , which belong to  $\Theta_n$  by Lemma 2.1.

Next, we prove that (2.12) is antisymmetric in  $z_1, \dots, z_{2n}$ . By (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i,j=1}^n e^{-6\pi i z_{n+j}} \theta(e^{6\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_i)}; p^6) \det_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \left( \frac{e^{-2\pi i z_{n+j}} \theta(e^{2\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_i)}; p^2)}{e^{-6\pi i z_{n+j}} \theta(e^{6\pi i(z_{n+j} \pm z_i)}; p^6)} \right) \\ & \sim \prod_{j=1}^{2n} \theta(b e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2) \theta(b^3 e^{\pm 6\pi i z_j}; p^6)^{n-1} \prod_{i,j=1}^n (v_{n+j} - v_i) \det_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \left( \frac{u_{n+j} - u_i}{v_{n+j} - v_i} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$u_j = \frac{\theta(a e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2)}{\theta(b e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2)}, \quad v_j = \frac{\theta(a^3 e^{\pm 6\pi i z_j}; p^6)}{\theta(b^3 e^{\pm 6\pi i z_j}; p^6)}, \quad (2.13)$$

with  $a$  and  $b$  parameters such that  $ab, a/b \notin p^{2\mathbb{Z}}$ . Here and below,  $\sim$  means equality up to a non-zero multiplicative factor independent of the variables  $z_j$ . The antisymmetry now follows from the general fact that

$$\prod_{i,j=1}^n (v_{n+j} - v_i) \det_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \left( \frac{u_{n+j} - u_i}{v_{n+j} - v_i} \right) \quad (2.14)$$

is antisymmetric under simultaneous permutations of  $u_j$  and  $v_j$ , see [O, Thm. 4.2].

It remains to show that (2.12) is not identically zero. To this end, we consider the limit  $z_{2n} \rightarrow z_n + 1/3$ . Expanding the determinant along the last row, only the entry in the last column contributes to the limit. Therefore, (2.12) reduces to a non-zero factor times a similar expression with  $n$  replaced by  $n-1$ . The non-vanishing of (2.12) then follows by induction on  $n$ .  $\square$

When  $p = 0$ , (2.12) is essentially the Tsuchiya determinant [T] (with  $\Delta = 1/2$ ), which is the partition function of the six-vertex model on a rectangle bounded by one reflecting edge and three domain walls. Recently, Filali generalized this to the elliptic level, interpreting (2.12) as a partition function for the 8VSOS model [F].

The antisymmetry of (2.14) is explicitly displayed in the identity [L, Thm. 7.2]

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i,j=1}^n (v_{n+j} - v_i) \det_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \left( \frac{u_{n+j} - u_i}{v_{n+j} - v_i} \right) \\ & = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2n} (\sqrt{v_j} + \sqrt{v_i}) \text{pfaff}_{1 \leq i,j \leq 2n} \left( \frac{u_j - u_i}{\sqrt{v_j} + \sqrt{v_i}} \right), \quad (2.15) \end{aligned}$$

see also [R1]. In the case at hand, it is natural to choose  $a$  and  $b$  in (2.13) as two of the four numbers  $e^{2\pi i \gamma_j}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq 3$ , since  $v_j$  then have meromorphic square roots.

For instance, choosing  $a = 1$ ,  $b = -1$  yields that (2.12) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{2n} e^{-2\pi i(3n-2)z_j} \theta(e^{4\pi i z_j}; p^2)}{\theta(-1; p^6)^{2n(n-1)}} \\ & \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2n} \left( \theta(e^{6\pi i z_j}, -e^{6\pi i z_i}; p^6) + \theta(-e^{6\pi i z_j}, e^{6\pi i z_i}; p^6) \right) \\ & \times \text{pfaff}_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2n} \left( \frac{e^{-2\pi i z_j} \theta(e^{2\pi i(z_j \pm z_i)})}{\theta(e^{6\pi i z_j}, -e^{6\pi i z_i}; p^6) + \theta(-e^{6\pi i z_j}, e^{6\pi i z_i}; p^6)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

There exist  $\binom{4}{2} = 6$  pfaffian formulas of this nature. Although more symmetric than (2.12), they seem less useful for our purposes.

**2.4. Elliptic functions.** We will write

$$x(z) = x(z, \tau) = \frac{\theta(-p\omega; p^2)^2 \theta(\omega e^{\pm 2\pi i z}; p^2)}{\theta(-\omega; p^2)^2 \theta(p\omega e^{\pm 2\pi i z}; p^2)}$$

(in [R3],  $x(z)$  was denoted  $\xi(e^{2\pi i z})$ ). This is an even elliptic function with periods 1 and  $\tau$ , and in fact generates the field of all such functions. We refer to the change of variables from  $z$  to  $x$  as *uniformization*. By (2.2),

$$x(z) - x(w) \sim \frac{\theta(e^{2\pi i(z \pm w)}; p^2)}{\theta(p\omega e^{\pm 2\pi i z}, p\omega e^{\pm 2\pi i w}; p^2)}, \quad (2.16)$$

which implies

$$x'(z) \sim \frac{e^{-2\pi i z} \theta(e^{4\pi i z}; p^2)}{\theta(p\omega e^{\pm 2\pi i z}; p^2)^2}. \quad (2.17)$$

The constants of proportionality (which depend on  $\tau$ ) can be given explicitly but are irrelevant for our purposes.

As in [R3], we will write

$$\zeta = \zeta(\tau) = \frac{\omega^2 \theta(-1, -p\omega; p^2)}{\theta(-p, -\omega; p^2)}. \quad (2.18)$$

The values of  $x$  on the lattice  $\Lambda$  are rational expressions in  $\zeta$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *The values  $\xi_j = x(\gamma_j)$  and  $\eta_j = x(\gamma_j + 1/3)$  are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0 &= 2\zeta + 1, & \xi_1 &= \frac{\zeta}{\zeta + 2}, & \xi_2 &= \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{\zeta + 2}, & \xi_3 &= 1, \\ \eta_0 &= 0, & \eta_1 &= \infty, & \eta_2 &= \frac{2\zeta + 1}{\zeta + 2}, & \eta_3 &= \zeta. \end{aligned}$$

These evaluations are all contained in, or follow from, [R3, Lemma 7.7].

Translating  $z$  by half-periods corresponds to rational transformations of  $x$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *If  $x = x(z)$ , then*

$$x\left(z + \frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{(2\zeta + 1)(x - \zeta)}{(\zeta + 2)x - (2\zeta + 1)}, \quad x\left(z + \frac{\tau}{2}\right) = \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.5, both sides of the two identities are elliptic functions of  $z$  with the same periods, zeroes and poles. Thus, it suffices to verify the case  $z = 0$ , which again follows from Lemma 2.5.  $\square$

Although we will not use it, we mention that translating  $z$  by  $1/3$  corresponds to an algebraic transformation of  $x$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *If  $x = x(z)$ ,  $x_+ = x(z + 1/3)$  and  $x_- = x(z - 1/3)$ , then*

$$x + x_+ + x_- = 2\zeta + 1,$$

$$\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{x_+} + \frac{1}{x_-} = \frac{\zeta + 2}{\zeta}.$$

*Proof.* We observe that  $x + x_+ + x_-$  is an elliptic function of  $z$  with periods  $1/3$  and  $\tau$ . Modulo these periods, the only possible pole is at  $z = \tau/2$ , where  $x_+$  and  $x_-$  have simple poles. However,

$$x_+\left(\frac{\tau}{2} + z\right) + x_-\left(\frac{\tau}{2} + z\right) = x\left(\frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + z\right) + x\left(\frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{1}{3} - z\right)$$

is an even function of  $z$  and thus cannot have a simple pole at  $z = 0$ . It follows that  $x + x_+ + x_-$  is independent of  $z$ . The value can then be computed using Lemma 2.5. The second statement is proved similarly.  $\square$

**2.5. Uniformization of  $\Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$ .** By Lemma 2.1 and (2.16), any  $f \in \Theta_n$  can be written

$$f(z) = e^{-2\pi iz} \theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2) \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{3n-2} P(x(z)), \quad (2.19)$$

where  $P$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $3n - 2$ .

As in [R3], we let

$$G(x, y) = \frac{1}{y - x} \begin{vmatrix} (\zeta + 2)x - \zeta & (\zeta + 2)y - \zeta \\ x^2(x - 2\zeta - 1) & y^2(y - 2\zeta - 1) \end{vmatrix} \quad (2.20)$$

$$= (\zeta + 2)xy(x + y) - \zeta(x^2 + y^2) - 2(\zeta^2 + 3\zeta + 1)xy + \zeta(2\zeta + 1)(x + y). \quad (2.21)$$

By (2.16) and Lemma 2.5,

$$e^{-6\pi iz_2} \theta(e^{6\pi i(z_2 \pm z_1)}; p^6) \sim \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz_1}, \omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz_2}; p^2)^3 (x_2 - x_1) G(x_1, x_2), \quad (2.22)$$

where  $x_j = x(z_j)$ . The uniformization of (2.5) is then given by

$$(x - x(a)) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (x - x(b_k)) G(x, x(b_k)) \quad (2.23)$$

in the sense that if  $P(x)$  denotes this expression, then (2.19) is proportional to (2.5). In the same sense, (2.6) is uniformized by

$$P_j(x) = x^{j-1}(x - 2\zeta - 1)^{\lfloor \frac{j-1}{2} \rfloor} ((\zeta + 2)x - \zeta)^{n - \lfloor \frac{j+1}{2} \rfloor}. \quad (2.24)$$

Thus, using the basis (2.6) in (2.11), we find that  $\Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$  is spanned by

$$\prod_{j=1}^{2n} e^{-2\pi i z_j} \theta(e^{4\pi i z_j}; p^2) \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2)^{3n-2} \Delta(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}), \quad (2.25)$$

where  $x_j = x(z_j)$ ,  $\Delta(x) = \prod_{i < j} (x_j - x_i)$  and

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) = \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2n} (P_j(x_i))}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_{2n})} \quad (2.26)$$

(by convention,  $T = 1$  when  $n = 0$ ). This is a symmetric polynomial in  $2n$  variables, depending also as a polynomial on the parameter  $\zeta$ . As we will see in §5.3, it is related to the polynomial  $H_{2n}$  introduced in [Z2] by a change of variables.

We now give the uniformization of the determinant (2.12).

**Lemma 2.8.** *The polynomial  $T$  is given by the alternative determinant formula*

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) = \frac{\prod_{i,j=1}^n G(x_i, x_{n+j})}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_n) \Delta(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n})} \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( \frac{1}{G(x_i, x_{n+j})} \right). \quad (2.27)$$

*Proof.* Using (2.16) and (2.22), it is straight-forward to check that (2.12) is proportional to (2.27). Thus, (2.26) and (2.27) are equal up to a multiplicative factor independent of the variables  $x_j$ . To see that this factor is 1, we compute the highest homogeneous component of both sides. Since the leading term in  $P_j(x)$  is  $(\zeta + 2)^{n - \lfloor (j+1)/2 \rfloor} x^{n+j-2}$ , since  $\sum_{j=1}^{2n} (n - \lfloor (j+1)/2 \rfloor) = n(n-1)$  and since  $\det(x_i^{j-1}) = \Delta(x)$ , the highest homogeneous component of (2.26) is  $(\zeta + 2)^{n(n-1)} \prod_{j=1}^{2n} x_j^{n-1}$ . On the other hand, since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^3 G(x/t, y/t) = (\zeta + 2)xy(x + y)$$

the highest homogeneous component of (2.27) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\zeta + 2)^{n(n-1)} \prod_{j=1}^{2n} x_j^{n-1} \prod_{i,j=1}^n (x_i + x_{n+j})}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_n) \Delta(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n})} \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( \frac{1}{x_i + x_{n+j}} \right) \\ &= (\zeta + 2)^{n(n-1)} \prod_{j=1}^{2n} x_j^{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

by the Cauchy determinant evaluation. □

By (2.15), there are also pfaffian formulas for  $T$ . For instance,

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2n} \frac{\sqrt{f(x_i)h(x_j)} + \sqrt{f(x_j)h(x_i)}}{x_j - x_i} \times \text{pfaff} \left( \frac{x_j - x_i}{\sqrt{f(x_i)h(x_j)} + \sqrt{f(x_j)h(x_i)}} \right),$$

where

$$f(x) = (\zeta + 2)x - \zeta, \quad h(x) = x^2(x - 2\zeta - 1).$$

Up to a multiplicative constant, this remains true if  $f$  and  $h$  are replaced by any two linearly independent elements in their span.

**2.6. Uniformization of the map  $\sigma$ .** As was explained in §2.2, the map  $\sigma$  defined in (2.7) maps  $\Theta_n$  to the space of entire functions satisfying (2.4), except that they are even rather than odd. It follows that, if  $f \in \Theta_n$ ,

$$(\sigma f)(z) = \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi i z}; p^2)^{3n} Q(x(z)) \quad (2.28)$$

for some polynomial  $Q$  of degree at most  $3n$ . The following result gives a useful description of the relation between  $P$  and  $Q$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** *For fixed  $n$ , define the linear operator  $\hat{\sigma}$  on the span of  $(P_j)_{j=1}^{2n}$  by*

$$\hat{\sigma}(P_j) = \begin{cases} e_0(x)P_j(x), & j \text{ odd}, \\ e_1(x)P_j(x), & j \text{ even}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(x) &= ((\zeta + 2)x - \zeta)(2\zeta + 1 - 3x), \\ e_1(x) &= (x - 2\zeta - 1)((\zeta + 2)x - 3\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

Then, there exists a constant  $C = C(\tau)$  such that the polynomials  $P$  and  $Q$  in (2.19) and (2.28) are related by  $Q = C\hat{\sigma}(P)$ . Moreover,

$$\hat{\sigma} \left( (x - a) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (x - b_k) G(x, b_k) \right) = (xe_1(x) - ae_0(x)) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (x - b_k) G(x, b_k).$$

*Proof.* Writing  $Q = \tilde{\sigma}(P)$ , we must prove that  $\tilde{\sigma} = C\hat{\sigma}$ . It is clear from (2.6) that  $\sigma(\psi_j)/\psi_j$  is independent of  $n$  and depends only on the parity of  $j$ . Since, for  $n = 1$ ,  $P_1 = 1$  and  $P_2 = x$ , it follows that

$$\frac{\tilde{\sigma}(P_j)}{P_j} = \begin{cases} \tilde{\sigma}(1), & j \text{ odd}, \\ \tilde{\sigma}(x)/x, & j \text{ even}. \end{cases}$$

Suppose now that  $f$  is given by (2.19), where  $n = 1$  and  $P$  vanishes at  $\eta_j$  for some  $j$ . Then,  $f(z + 1/3)$  and  $f(z - 1/3)$  vanish at  $z = \gamma_j$  and at  $z = \gamma_j + 1/3$ , so  $Q$

vanishes at  $\xi_j$  and  $\eta_j$ . (Vanishing at  $\eta_1 = \infty$  should be interpreted as vanishing of the top coefficient.) Using this for  $j = 0$  and  $j = 1$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\sigma}(x) &= x(x - 2\zeta - 1)(ax + b), \\ \tilde{\sigma}(1) &= ((\zeta + 2)x - \zeta)(cx + d)\end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $a, b, c, d$ . For  $j = 2$  and  $j = 3$ , we find that

$$(\zeta + 2)\tilde{\sigma}(x) - (2\zeta + 1)\tilde{\sigma}(1)$$

vanishes at  $x = \zeta(2\zeta + 1)/(\zeta + 2)$  and at  $x = (2\zeta + 1)/(\zeta + 2)$ , and that

$$\tilde{\sigma}(x) - \zeta\tilde{\sigma}(1)$$

vanishes at  $x = 1$  and  $x = \zeta$ . This gives a system of four linear equations for  $a, b, c, d$ . The solution space is one-dimensional and spanned by

$$a = \zeta + 2, \quad b = c = -3, \quad d = 2\zeta + 1.$$

Thus, for some constant  $C$ ,  $\tilde{\sigma}(x) = Cxe_1(x)$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}(1) = Ce_0(x)$ , so that  $\tilde{\sigma} = C\hat{\sigma}$ .

Finally, we note that if  $f$  is given by (2.5), then  $\sigma(f)/f$  is independent of  $n$  and the parameters  $b_j$ . By our previous observation that (2.5) is uniformized by (2.23), it follows that

$$\frac{\hat{\sigma}\left((x-a)\prod_{k=1}^{n-1}(x-b_k)G(x, b_k)\right)}{(x-a)\prod_{k=1}^{n-1}(x-b_k)G(x, b_k)} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}(x-a)}{x-a} = \frac{xe_1(x) - ae_0(x)}{x-a}.$$

□

Let us now consider the result of applying  $\hat{\sigma}$  to some of the variables in (2.25). For  $0 \leq k \leq 2n$ , let

$$\begin{aligned}T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}) \\ = \frac{(\text{id}^{\otimes k} \otimes \hat{\sigma}^{\otimes(2n-k)})\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_{2n})T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n})}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k)\Delta(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n})}.\end{aligned}\quad (2.29)$$

This is a polynomial, which is symmetric in its first  $k$  and last  $2n - k$  variables, and generalizes  $T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) = T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}; -)$ . By construction, the function

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{j=1}^k e^{-2\pi i z_j} \theta(e^{4\pi i z_j}; p^2) \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2)^{3n-2} \prod_{j=k+1}^{2n} \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2)^{3n} \\ \times \Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) \Delta(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}) T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}),\end{aligned}\quad (2.30)$$

where  $x_j = x(z_j)$ , spans the one-dimensional space  $(\text{id}^{\otimes k} \otimes \sigma^{\otimes(2n-k)})\Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$ .

Applying Lemma 2.9 to (2.26) gives the more general identity

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}) = \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2n}(A_{ij})}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k)\Delta(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n})}, \quad (2.31)$$

where

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} P_j(x_i), & 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ e_1(x_i)P_j(x_i), & k+1 \leq i \leq 2n, j \text{ even}, \\ e_0(x_i)P_j(x_i), & k+1 \leq i \leq 2n, j \text{ odd}. \end{cases}$$

One can also extend the alternative determinant formula (2.27). In view of the ostensible asymmetry of the variables, we replace the operator  $\text{id}^{\otimes k} \otimes \hat{\sigma}^{\otimes(2n-k)}$  in (2.29) by

$$(-1)^{l(n-k)} (\text{id}^{\otimes k} \otimes \hat{\sigma}^{\otimes(n-k)} \otimes \text{id}^{\otimes l} \otimes \hat{\sigma}^{\otimes(n-l)}).$$

The left-hand side is then replaced by

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+l}; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, x_{n+l+1}, \dots, x_{2n}).$$

Expanding the determinant in (2.27) gives

$$\Delta(x)T(x) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{n+\sigma(i)}) \prod_{i,j=1, j \neq \sigma(i)}^n (x_i - x_{n+j}) G(x_i, x_{n+j}).$$

We can use Lemma 2.9 to compute the image of this expression when  $\hat{\sigma}$  acts on any subset of the variables. Re-rewriting the result as a determinant gives

$$\begin{aligned} & T(x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+l}; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, x_{n+l+1}, \dots, x_{2n}) \\ &= \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k, l+1 \leq j \leq n} (x_{n+j} - x_i) \prod_{k+1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq l} (x_i - x_{n+j}) \prod_{i,j=1}^n G(x_i, x_{n+j})}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) \Delta(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) \Delta(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+l}) \Delta(x_{n+l+1}, \dots, x_{2n})} \\ & \quad \times \det(B), \quad (2.32) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{G(x_i, x_{n+j})}, & 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq l, \\ \frac{Q(x_i, x_{n+j})}{(x_{n+j} - x_i)G(x_i, x_{n+j})}, & 1 \leq i \leq k, l+1 \leq j \leq n, \\ \frac{Q(x_{n+j}, x_i)}{(x_i - x_{n+j})G(x_i, x_{n+j})}, & k+1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq l, \\ \frac{R(x_i, x_{n+j})}{G(x_i, x_{n+j})}, & k+1 \leq i \leq n, l+1 \leq j \leq n, \end{cases}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(x, y) &= ye_1(y) - xe_0(y), \\
R(x, y) &= \frac{e_0(x)ye_1(y) - xe_1(x)e_0(y)}{y - x} \\
&= 3(\zeta + 2)^2 x^2 y^2 + \zeta(\zeta + 2)(2\zeta + 1)(x^2 + y^2) \\
&\quad - 2(\zeta^2 + 4\zeta + 1)((\zeta + 2)xy + \zeta(2\zeta + 1))(x + y) \\
&\quad + 4(\zeta^4 + 4\zeta^3 + 8\zeta^2 + 4\zeta + 1)xy + 3\zeta^2(2\zeta + 1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For fixed  $k + l$ , varying  $k$  and  $l$  in (2.32) gives non-equivalent expressions for the same quantity. For instance, to compute  $T(x_1, x_2; x_3, x_4)$  one may use (2.32) with  $k = 2, l = 0$ , which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x_1, x_2; x_3, x_4) &= ((x_4 - x_1)(x_3 - x_2)G(x_1, x_4)G(x_2, x_3)Q(x_1, x_3)Q(x_2, x_4) \\
&\quad - (x_3 - x_1)(x_4 - x_2)G(x_1, x_3)G(x_2, x_4)Q(x_1, x_4)Q(x_2, x_3)) / (x_2 - x_1)(x_4 - x_3)
\end{aligned}$$

or with  $k = l = 1$ , which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x_1, x_2; x_3, x_4) &= (x_4 - x_1)(x_3 - x_2)G(x_1, x_4)G(x_2, x_3)R(x_3, x_4) \\
&\quad - G(x_1, x_2)G(x_3, x_4)Q(x_1, x_4)Q(x_2, x_3).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude with some elementary but useful consequences of (2.32).

**Lemma 2.10.** *One has*

$$\begin{aligned}
T(t, x_2, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n-1}, t) \\
= (-1)^{k+1} 2G(t, t) \prod_{j=2}^{2n-1} G(x_j, t) T(x_2, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n-1}). \quad (2.33)
\end{aligned}$$

To see this, expand the determinant in (2.32) along the first row and then let  $x_1 = x_{2n} = t$ . Then, only the term corresponding to the last column gives a non-zero contribution. Rewriting the complementary minor in terms of the polynomial  $T$ , using also  $Q(t, t) = 2G(t, t)$ , gives (2.33) after simplification.

**Lemma 2.11.** *If  $k + l = 2n$  and  $G(a, b) = 0$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned}
T(x_1, \dots, x_k, a, b; y_1, \dots, y_l) &= \left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)b - \zeta}{(\zeta + 2)a - \zeta} \right)^{k-n} \\
&\quad \times \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{G(x_j, a)}{x_j - b} \prod_{j=1}^l (y_j - b) G(y_j, b) T(x_1, \dots, x_k; y_1, \dots, y_l).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We expand (2.32) along the first row and then let  $x_1 = a$ ,  $x_{n+l} = b$ . Only the  $l$ :th column contributes, and after simplification we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & T(a, x_2, \dots, x_k, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+l-1}, b; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, x_{n+l+1}, \dots, x_{2n}) \\ &= \prod_{j=2}^k \frac{G(x_j, b)}{x_j - a} \prod_{j=n+1}^{n+l-1} \frac{G(x_j, a)}{x_j - b} \prod_{j=k+1}^n G(x_j, b)(x_j - b) \prod_{j=n+l+1}^{2n} G(x_j, a)(x_j - a) \\ & \quad \times T(x_2, \dots, x_k, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+l-1}; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, x_{n+l+1}, \dots, x_{2n}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Next we use that, when  $G(a, b) = 0$ , the quantity  $(c - b)G(b, c)/(c - a)G(a, c)$  is independent of  $c$ . This follows from (2.20); indeed, it is true for any function of the form  $G(x, y) = (\phi(x)\psi(y) - \psi(x)\phi(y))/(y - x)$ . Choosing  $c = \zeta/(\zeta + 2)$ , we find that

$$\frac{(c - b)G(b, c)}{(c - a)G(a, c)} = \frac{(\zeta + 2)b - \zeta}{(\zeta + 2)a - \zeta}. \quad (2.35)$$

Using this identity, (2.34) can be expressed in the desired form.  $\square$

If  $G(a, b) = 0$ , we can apply either Lemma 2.10 or Lemma 2.11 to  $T(\mathbf{x}, a, b; \mathbf{y}, b)$ . This leads to the following identity.

**Lemma 2.12.** *When  $k + l = 2n + 1$  and  $G(a, b) = 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=1}^l (y_j - b) T(x_1, \dots, x_k; y_1, \dots, y_l, b) \\ &= \frac{2G(b, b)}{a - b} \left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)b - \zeta}{(\zeta + 2)a - \zeta} \right)^n \prod_{j=1}^k (a - x_j) T(x_1, \dots, x_k, a; y_1, \dots, y_l). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we mention the following useful recursions, which follow from applying the Jacobi–Desnanot identity (see e.g. [K, Prop. 10]) to (2.32).

**Lemma 2.13.** *The polynomial  $T$  satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} (a - b)(c - d)T(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(a, b, c, d, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &= G(a, d)G(b, c)T(a, c, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(b, d, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \\ &\quad - G(a, c)G(b, d)T(a, d, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(b, c, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.36a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (a - b)T(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(a, b, c, \mathbf{x}; d, \mathbf{y}) &= (a - d)G(a, d)G(b, c)T(a, c, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(b, \mathbf{x}; d, \mathbf{y}) \\ &\quad - (b - d)G(a, c)G(b, d)T(a, \mathbf{x}; d, \mathbf{y})T(b, c, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.36b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} T(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(a, c, \mathbf{x}; b, d, \mathbf{y}) &= (d - a)(b - c)G(a, d)G(b, c)T(a, c, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(\mathbf{x}; b, d, \mathbf{y}) \\ &\quad - G(a, c)G(b, d)T(a, \mathbf{x}; d, \mathbf{y})T(c, \mathbf{x}; b, \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.36c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (a - b)(c - d)T(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})T(\mathbf{x}; a, b, c, d, \mathbf{y}) &= G(a, d)G(b, c)T(\mathbf{x}; a, c, \mathbf{y})T(\mathbf{x}; b, d, \mathbf{y}) \\ &\quad - G(a, c)G(b, d)T(\mathbf{x}; a, d, \mathbf{y})T(\mathbf{x}; b, c, \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.36d)$$

**2.7. The functions  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$ .** As in §2.2, let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ , with  $m = 2n - |\mathbf{k}| \geq 0$ . Specializing variables in the polynomial  $T$ , we can construct elements of the space  $(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}})^{\wedge m}$ . We will use the notation

$$\xi^{\mathbf{k}} = (\xi_0^{(k_0)}, \xi_1^{(k_1)}, \xi_2^{(k_2)}, \xi_3^{(k_3)}) = (\underbrace{\xi_0, \dots, \xi_0}_{k_0}, \underbrace{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_1}_{k_1}, \underbrace{\xi_2, \dots, \xi_2}_{k_2}, \underbrace{\xi_3, \dots, \xi_3}_{k_3}).$$

**Proposition 2.14.** *With  $n$ ,  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $m$  as above, define*

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \frac{(-1)^{\binom{|\mathbf{k}^-|}{2}} T(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi^{\mathbf{k}^+}; \xi^{\mathbf{k}^-})}{2^{|\mathbf{k}^-|} \prod_{i,j=0}^3 G(\xi_i, \xi_j)^{k_i^- k_j^+} \prod_{j=1}^m \prod_{i=0}^3 G(x_j, \xi_i)^{k_i^-}}. \quad (2.37)$$

Then,

$$\prod_{j=1}^m \left( e^{-2\pi i z_j} \theta(e^{4\pi i z_j}; p^2) \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi i z_j}; p^2)^{3n-2} \prod_{l=0}^3 (x_j - \xi_l)^{k_l} \right) \times \Delta(x_1, \dots, x_m) T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m), \quad (2.38)$$

is an element of  $(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}})^{\wedge m}$ .

We will prove later (Corollary 3.9) that  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  does not vanish identically, and deduce as a consequence (Theorem 2.3) that  $\dim \Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}} = m$ . It follows that (2.38) spans the space  $(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}})^{\wedge m}$ .

To give an example,

$$\begin{aligned} T_0^{(-2,1,0,0)}(x) &= -\frac{T(x, \xi_1; \xi_0, \xi_0)}{4G(\xi_0, \xi_1)^2 G(x, \xi_0)^2}, \\ &= \frac{(2\zeta + 1)^2 (\zeta + 2)}{\zeta^2 x^3} ((\zeta^2 + \zeta + 1)x(2\zeta + 1 - x) + \zeta(2\zeta + 1)^2). \end{aligned}$$

In general, as a function of the variables  $x_j$ ,  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  is a symmetric rational function with poles only at the points  $x_j = \eta_i$ , where  $k_i < 0$ ,  $i \neq 1$ .

To prove Proposition 2.14 we note that, by Lemma 2.2, we can construct an element in  $(\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}})^{\wedge m}$  by starting from  $\Psi \in (\text{id}^{\otimes(m+|\mathbf{k}^+|)} \otimes \sigma^{\otimes|\mathbf{k}^-|}) \Theta_{n+|\mathbf{k}^-|}^{\wedge 2(n+|\mathbf{k}^-|)}$ , applying specialized derivatives to the last  $|\mathbf{k}^+| + |\mathbf{k}^-|$  variables and finally dividing by  $\Phi$ . For instance, if  $\mathbf{k} = (2, -2, 0, 0)$  we should take

$$\left. \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^m \theta(e^{6\pi i(\gamma_1 \pm z_j)}; p^6)^2} \frac{\partial^3}{\partial z_{m+1}^3} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{m+2}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_{m+3}^2} \frac{\partial^0}{\partial z_{m+4}^0} \right|_{z_{m+1}=z_{m+2}=\gamma_0, z_{m+3}=z_{m+4}=\gamma_1} \Psi(z_1, \dots, z_m, z_{m+1}, z_{m+2}, z_{m+3}, z_{m+4}).$$

Returning to the general case, we choose  $\Psi$  as in (2.30) and observe that  $\theta(e^{4\pi i z}; p^2)$  has a single zero at  $z = \gamma_j$  for each  $j$ . Moreover, by (2.17),  $x(z) - x(w)$  has a double zero at  $z = w$  when  $w = \gamma_j$ . Thus, all derivatives must hit the prefactor and we are left with a specialization of the polynomial  $T$ . Finally, we

uniformize  $\Phi$  using (2.22). This leads to (2.37), up to a multiplicative constant. The choice of constant is essentially determined by the following property.

**Lemma 2.15.** *For  $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^4$ ,  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{l})}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi^{\mathbf{l}})$ .*

*Proof.* By induction, we may choose  $\mathbf{l}$  as a standard basis vector  $e_l$ ,  $0 \leq l \leq 3$ . If  $k_l \geq 0$ , the statement is then obvious, since the prefactor in (2.37) is the same for  $\mathbf{k}$  and for  $\mathbf{k} + e_l$ . If  $k_l < 0$ , then the statement is easily proved using (2.33).  $\square$

When  $k_j \geq 0$  for each  $j$ ,  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  is simply given by the specialization

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = T(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi^{\mathbf{k}}).$$

If  $k_j \geq -1$  for each  $j$ , one can use the following result to express  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  in terms of the polynomials (2.26) (rather than the more general polynomials (2.31)). Corresponding identities for  $k_j \leq -2$  involve derivatives and do not seem very useful.

**Lemma 2.16.** *The quantity  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m)$  is equal to*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{T_{n+1}^{(k_0+1, k_1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, 0)}{(-2\zeta(\zeta+1)^2)^n \prod_{j=0}^3 \xi_j^{k_j} \prod_{j=1}^m x_j}, & k_0 \geq -1, & (2.39) \\ & \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T_{n+1}^{(k_0, k_1+1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, t)}{t^n (-2\zeta^2(\zeta+1)^2/(\zeta+2))^n}, & k_1 \geq -1, \\ & \frac{T_{n+1}^{(k_0, k_1, k_2+1, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, \eta_2)}{(2\zeta^2(\zeta+1))^n \prod_{j=0}^3 (\xi_j - \eta_2)^{k_j} \prod_{j=1}^m (x_j - \eta_2)}, & k_2 \geq -1, \\ & \frac{T_{n+1}^{(k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, \zeta)}{(2\zeta(\zeta+1))^n \prod_{j=0}^3 (\xi_j - \zeta)^{k_j} \prod_{j=1}^m (x_j - \zeta)}, & k_3 \geq -1. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $k_0 \geq -1$ . In order to treat the cases  $k_0 = -1$  and  $k_0 \geq 0$  simultaneously, we apply Lemma 2.15 to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{T_{n+1}^{(k_0+1, k_1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, 0)}{T_n^{(k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m)} = \frac{T_{n+1}^{(0, k_1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi_0^{(k_0+1)}, \eta_0)}{T_n^{(-1, k_1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi_0^{(k_0+1)})} \\ & = 2G(x, \xi_0)G(\xi_0, \xi_0)^{k_0+1} \prod_{j=1}^3 \frac{(-1)^{k_j^-} G(\xi_0, \xi_j)^{k_j^+}}{G(\eta_0, \xi_j)^{k_j^-}} \\ & \quad \times \frac{T(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi_0^{(k_0+1)}, \xi_1^{(k_1^+)}, \xi_2^{(k_2^+)}, \xi_3^{(k_3^+)}, \eta_0; \xi_1^{(k_1^-)}, \xi_2^{(k_2^-)}, \xi_3^{(k_3^-)})}{T(x_1, \dots, x_m, \xi_0^{(k_0+1)}, \xi_1^{(k_1^+)}, \xi_2^{(k_2^+)}, \xi_3^{(k_3^+)}; \xi_1^{(k_1^-)}, \xi_2^{(k_2^-)}, \xi_3^{(k_3^-)}, \xi_0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

We now observe that  $G(\eta_0, \xi_0) = 0$ , so that Lemma 2.12 is applicable. Using also (2.35), (2.40) simplifies to

$$\left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)\eta_0 - \zeta}{(\zeta + 2)\xi_0 - \zeta} \right)^n \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{G(x_j, \xi_0)}{\eta_0 - x_j} \prod_{j=0}^3 \left( \frac{G(\xi_j, \xi_0)}{\eta_0 - \xi_j} \right)^{k_j}.$$

Since

$$\frac{(\zeta + 2)\eta_0 - \zeta}{(\zeta + 2)\xi_0 - \zeta} = -\frac{\zeta}{2(\zeta + 1)^2}, \quad \frac{G(x, \xi_0)}{\eta_0 - x} = -2(\zeta + 1)^2 x,$$

we arrive at (2.39). The remaining identities can be derived similarly; they also follow from (2.39) using the symmetries of Corollary 2.18 below.  $\square$

**2.8. Modularity.** We will now discuss the behaviour of  $x$  and  $\zeta$  under modular transformations. This material is not vital for the remainder of our paper, but provides some motivation as it explains the symmetries of the polynomial  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  discussed in §2.9, and identifies the specializations of  $\zeta$  considered in §3 and §4 with evaluations at cusps.

We recall some basic facts on modular functions, see e.g. [S]. Let  $\Gamma$  be one of the congruence groups

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_0(n) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}); c \equiv 0 \pmod{n} \right\}, \\ \Gamma_0(m, n) &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}); c \equiv 0 \pmod{m}, b \equiv 0 \pmod{n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact,  $\Gamma_0(m, n) \simeq \Gamma_0(mn)$  as the two groups are conjugate in  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ . The group  $\Gamma$  acts on the upper half-plane  $\mathbb{H}$ , and on the set  $\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$ , by

$$A.\tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will write  $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$  for the corresponding field of modular functions, that is, meromorphic functions  $f$  on  $\mathbb{H}$  such that  $f(A.\tau) = f(\tau)$  for  $A \in \Gamma$ . The normalizer  $N(\Gamma) = N_{\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}(\Gamma)/\Gamma$  acts naturally on  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma$  and  $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ .

If  $\tau \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$  is the unique fix-point of some element in  $\Gamma$ , then the  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $\tau$  is called a *cusp*. Denoting by  $\overline{\mathbb{H}/\Gamma}$  the union of  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma$  and the set of cusps, one can equip  $\overline{\mathbb{H}/\Gamma}$  with the structure of a compact Riemann surface, so that any modular function extends meromorphically to the compactification.

From now on, we let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_0(6, 2) \simeq \Gamma_0(12)$ . The corresponding equivalence of modular functions is

$$f \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma_0(6, 2)) \iff (\tau \mapsto f(2\tau)) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma_0(12)). \quad (2.41)$$

It follows from [AL, Thm. 8] that  $N(\Gamma) \simeq S_2 \times S_3$ . To describe  $N(\Gamma)$  explicitly, we note that  $\Gamma_0(3) = N_{\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})}(\Gamma) \subseteq N_{\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}(\Gamma)$ . The projection  $\Gamma_0(3) \rightarrow N_{\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})}(\Gamma)/\Gamma$  amounts to reducing all matrix elements mod 2, which gives a surjection to  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \simeq S_3$ . We choose  $\tau \mapsto \tau/(3\tau + 1)$  and  $\tau \mapsto (2\tau + 1)/(3\tau + 2)$  as

representatives of two generators for  $S_3$ . Moreover,  $N_{SL(2, \mathbb{R})}(\Gamma)$  contains the Fricke involution  $\tau \mapsto -1/3\tau$ . These three transformations indeed generate  $S_2 \times S_3$ .

The elements in  $\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$  that are the unique fix-point of some element in  $\Gamma$  are  $\infty$  and the numbers  $k/6l$  with  $(k, l) = 1$ . The cusps are given by

$$C_0, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_6, C_\infty,$$

where

$$C_j = \left\{ \frac{k}{6l}; (k, l) = 1, k \equiv \pm j \pmod{12} \right\}, \quad j \neq \infty,$$

$$C_\infty = \left\{ \frac{k}{6l}; (k, l) = 1, k \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6} \right\} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

The action of  $S_2 \times S_3$  extends to a permutation action on the cusps. Explicitly, the generator  $\tau \mapsto \tau/(3\tau + 1)$  corresponds to  $C_2 \leftrightarrow C_\infty$ ,  $C_3 \leftrightarrow C_6$ , the generator  $\tau \mapsto (2\tau + 1)/(3\tau + 2)$  to  $C_0 \leftrightarrow C_3$ ,  $C_4 \leftrightarrow C_\infty$  and the generator  $\tau \mapsto -1/3\tau$  to  $C_0 \leftrightarrow C_\infty$ ,  $C_2 \leftrightarrow C_6$ ,  $C_3 \leftrightarrow C_4$ . Note that the  $S_3$ -part of the action preserves the two sets of cusps  $\{C_2, C_4, C_\infty\}$  and  $\{C_0, C_3, C_6\}$ . We will refer to the first set of cusps as *trigonometric* and the second set as *non-trigonometric*. As we will see,  $T_n^{(k)}$  behaves quite differently at these two sets of cusps.

We will now consider the modular properties of the function  $x$ . We first observe that, if  $f(z) = f(z, \tau)$  is an even elliptic function with periods 1 and  $\tau$ , then the same is true for the function

$$\hat{f}(z) = f\left(\frac{z}{c\tau + d}, \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}\right), \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}).$$

We apply this when  $f(z) = x(z + 1/2, \tau)$ . Up to quasi-periodicity and evenness, the zeroes and poles of  $\hat{f}$  are a single zero at  $z_0 = (c\tau + d)/6$  and a single pole at  $z_\infty = (a\tau + b)/2 + (c\tau + d)/6$ . Since  $f(0) = \hat{f}(0) = 1$ , it follows that

$$\hat{f}(z) = \frac{(1 - f(z_\infty))(f(z) - f(z_0))}{(1 - f(z_0))(f(z) - f(z_\infty))}. \quad (2.42)$$

In particular, if  $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(3)$ , then  $\hat{f}$  depends only on the residue class of  $A$  in  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ . By the discussion above, this leads to symmetries of  $x$  under  $S_3$ . Using Lemma 2.5, we can rewrite (2.42) for two generators of  $S_3$  as

$$x\left(\frac{z - 1/2}{3\tau + 1} + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\tau}{3\tau + 1}\right) = \frac{1}{x}, \quad (2.43a)$$

$$x\left(\frac{z - 1/2}{3\tau + 2} + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2\tau + 1}{3\tau + 2}\right) = \frac{(\zeta + 2)x - (2\zeta + 1)}{1 - \zeta}. \quad (2.43b)$$

where  $x = x(z, \tau)$  and  $\zeta = \zeta(\tau)$ .

Specializing  $z = 1/2 + 1/3$  in (2.43), it follows that  $\zeta \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma_0(6, 2))$ , and that  $\zeta$  transforms under the  $S_3$  action by

$$\zeta \left( \frac{\tau}{3\tau + 1} \right) = \frac{1}{\zeta}, \quad (2.44a)$$

$$\zeta \left( \frac{2\tau + 1}{3\tau + 2} \right) = -\zeta - 1, \quad (2.44b)$$

where  $\zeta = \zeta(\tau)$ . Moreover, for the Fricke involution,

$$\zeta \left( -\frac{1}{3\tau} \right) = \frac{1 - \zeta}{1 + 2\zeta}.$$

One way to check this is to use [R3, Lemma 9.1] to express both sides in terms of Dedekind's eta function. Since it can also be deduced from [M, Table 3] (see below) we do not give the details.

Using (2.44) and Lemma 2.6, (2.43) can be written more compactly as

$$\begin{aligned} x \left( \frac{z}{3\tau + 1}, \frac{\tau}{3\tau + 1} \right) &= \frac{(\zeta + 2)x}{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}, \\ x \left( \frac{z}{3\tau + 2}, \frac{2\tau + 1}{3\tau + 2} \right) &= \frac{(\zeta + 1)x}{\zeta - x}. \end{aligned}$$

The meromorphic extension of  $\zeta$  to the cusps is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(C_2) &= -\frac{1}{2}, & \zeta(C_4) &= 1, & \zeta(C_\infty) &= -2, \\ \zeta(C_0) &= -1, & \zeta(C_3) &= 0, & \zeta(C_6) &= \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, it follows from (2.18) that

$$\zeta = -2 + 6p + \mathcal{O}(p^2), \quad \tau \rightarrow i\infty, \quad (2.45)$$

which covers the case of  $C_\infty$ . The other values now follow using the symmetries; for instance,

$$\zeta(C_2) = \zeta \left( \frac{C_\infty}{3C_\infty + 1} \right) = \frac{1}{\zeta(C_\infty)} = -\frac{1}{2}.$$

Another consequence of (2.45) is that  $\zeta + 2$  has a simple zero at  $C_\infty$ . Applying the symmetries,  $\zeta$  has a simple pole at  $C_6$ . Since  $\zeta$  has no poles in  $\mathbb{H}$  or at the other cusps, it follows from [Fo, Thm. 4.24] that  $\zeta$  is a bijection from  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_0(6, 2)$  to  $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Thus,  $\zeta$  generates the field  $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ , that is, it is a *Hauptmodul*. In particular, we recover the known fact that  $\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_0(6, 2)$  is a sphere.

By (2.41), the function  $\tau \mapsto \zeta(2\tau)$  is a *Hauptmodul* for  $\Gamma_0(12)$ . In the literature, one usually considers *Hauptmoduln* that vanish at  $C_\infty$  and have a pole at  $C_0$ . Let  $t = t_{12}$  be such a *Hauptmodul*, normalized as in [M]. Comparing the values at cusps (see [M, Table 2]), we find that

$$\zeta(2\tau) = -\frac{t + 4}{t + 2}. \quad (2.46)$$

This is also easy to see by comparing explicit formulas. By routine manipulation of infinite products,

$$\zeta(2\tau) = -2 \frac{\eta(\tau)^3 \eta(4\tau)^6 \eta(6\tau)^3}{\eta(2\tau)^9 \eta(3\tau) \eta(12\tau)^2},$$

where  $\eta(\tau) = p^{1/12}(p^2; p^2)_\infty$  is the Dedekind eta function. One can then verify (2.46) from [M, Table 3].

Finally, we comment on the role of the cusps in relation to the three-colour model and the XYZ spin chain. In the three-colour model, the states are three-colourings of a square lattice, where adjacent squares have distinct colour, and the three colours have independent weights  $t_0, t_1, t_2$ . The relations between these weights and the variable  $\zeta$  can be written [R3]

$$\frac{(t_0 t_1 + t_0 t_2 + t_1 t_2)^3}{(t_0 t_1 t_2)^2} = 27 + \frac{(\zeta - 1)^4 (\zeta + 2)(2\zeta + 1)}{\zeta(\zeta + 1)^4}.$$

In particular, the trigonometric cusps  $\zeta = -1/2$ ,  $\zeta = 1$  and  $\zeta = -2$  correspond to a parameter regime containing the enumeration point  $t_0 = t_1 = t_2$  when all states have equal weight. The non-trigonometric cusps  $\zeta = -1$ ,  $\zeta = 0$  and  $\zeta = \infty$  correspond to the limit cases  $t_j \rightarrow 0$  and  $t_j \rightarrow \infty$ , and thus control the maximal and minimal number of squares of each colour, see [R3, Cor. 3.3] for the case of domain wall boundary conditions.

In the conventions of [Z2], the coupling constants of the XYZ chain are

$$J_x = \frac{1}{1 - \zeta}, \quad J_y = \frac{1}{1 + \zeta}, \quad J_z = -\frac{1}{2}$$

(here we have used (5.5)). Note that  $J_x J_y + J_x J_z + J_y J_z = 0$ , which is equivalent to the supersymmetry condition  $\Delta = -1/2$ . Clearly, the trigonometric cusps correspond to the conditions

$$J_x = J_y, \quad J_x = J_z, \quad J_y = J_z$$

and thus to the XXZ chain, while the non-trigonometric cusps correspond to

$$J_x = \infty, \quad J_y = \infty, \quad J_z = \infty,$$

that is, to the XY chain.

**2.9. Symmetries.** The polynomials  $T$  have a useful symmetry under the group  $S_4$ , acting by rational transformations on the variables  $x_j$  and  $\zeta$ . This is easy to understand geometrically. As we observed in §2.2, if  $f \in \Theta_n$  then so does  $f(z + \gamma_j)$  for  $j = 0, 3$  and  $e^{6\pi i n z} f(z + \gamma_j)$  for  $j = 1, 3$ . These maps induce an action of  $S_2 \times S_2$  on the space  $\Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$  (which comes from a genuine action on  $\Theta_n$  when  $n$  is even but a projective action when  $n$  is odd). By Lemma 2.6, this results in an  $S_2 \times S_2$  symmetry of  $T$  under simultaneous rational transformations of the variables  $x_j$ . Moreover, it is easy to check that if  $z \mapsto f(z, \tau)$  is in  $\Theta_n$ , then so is

$$z \mapsto \exp\left(-\frac{6\pi i n c z^2}{c\tau + d}\right) f\left(\frac{z}{c\tau + d}, \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}\right), \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(3),$$

the restriction  $c \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  being necessary for preserving property (2.4b). It follows that, if  $\Psi(z_1, \dots, z_{2n}; \tau) \in \Theta_n^{\wedge 2n}$ , then

$$\Psi(z_1, \dots, z_{2n}; \tau) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{6\pi inc \sum_{k=1}^{2n} z_k^2}{c\tau + d}\right) \Psi\left(\frac{z_1}{c\tau + d}, \dots, \frac{z_{2n}}{c\tau + d}; \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}\right).$$

By (2.43) and (2.44), these modular transformations induce an  $S_3$  symmetry of the polynomials  $T$ . Taken together, translations by half-periods and modular transformations generate an action of  $S_4$  described in Proposition 2.17.

We stress that there is no symmetry of the polynomials  $T$  corresponding to the Fricke involution. Accordingly, the behaviour of  $T$  at the trigonometric and the non-trigonometric cusps is quite different, see §3 and §4.

The above considerations only determine the  $S_4$  symmetry up to factors depending on  $\zeta$ . To derive it explicitly, we note that (writing  $G(x, y; \zeta) = G(x, y)$  etc.)

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, y; \zeta) &= \zeta^2 x^2 y^2 G\left(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{1}{y}; \frac{1}{\zeta}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\zeta - 1}{\zeta + 2}\right)^2 G\left(\frac{(\zeta + 2)x - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}, \frac{(\zeta + 2)y - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}; -\zeta - 1\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{(\zeta + 2)}{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}\right)^2 x^2 y^2 G\left(\frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x}, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)y}; \zeta\right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x, y; \zeta) &= \zeta^2 x y^3 Q\left(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{1}{y}; \frac{1}{\zeta}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\zeta - 1}{\zeta + 2}\right)^2 Q\left(\frac{(\zeta + 2)x - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}, \frac{(\zeta + 2)y - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}; -\zeta - 1\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{(\zeta + 2)}{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}\right)^2 x y^3 Q\left(\frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x}, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)y}; \zeta\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R(x, y; \zeta) &= \zeta^4 x^2 y^2 R\left(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{1}{y}; \frac{1}{\zeta}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\zeta - 1}{\zeta + 2}\right)^2 R\left(\frac{(\zeta + 2)x - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}, \frac{(\zeta + 2)y - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}; -\zeta - 1\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{(\zeta + 2)}{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}\right)^2 x^2 y^2 R\left(\frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x}, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)y}; \zeta\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using these identities in (2.32) yields the following symmetries.

**Proposition 2.17.** *Writing  $T(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \zeta) = T(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$ , the polynomial  $T$  satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}; \zeta) \\ &= \zeta^{2(n(n+1)-k)} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{3n-k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{2n} x_j^{n+k+1} T(x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_k^{-1}; x_{k+1}^{-1}, \dots, x_{2n}^{-1}; \zeta^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.48a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left( \frac{\zeta - 1}{\zeta + 2} \right)^{n(n+1)+2nk-k(k+1)} \\ &\quad \times T\left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)x_1 - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}, \dots, \dots, \frac{(\zeta + 2)x_{2n} - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}; -\zeta - 1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.48b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left( \frac{\zeta + 2}{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)} \right)^{n(n+1)+2nk-k(k+1)} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{3n-k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{2n} x_j^{n+k+1} \\ &\quad \times T\left( \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x_1}, \dots, \dots, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x_{2n}}; \zeta \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.48c)$$

Composing these three involutions indeed generate the group  $S_4$ . For later use, we note that successive application of (2.48a), (2.48b) and (2.48a) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}; \zeta) \\ &= \frac{(\zeta + 1)^{2(n(n+1)-k)}}{((\zeta - 1)(2\zeta + 1))^{n(n+1)+2nk-k(k+1)}} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{j=1}^k ((\zeta + 2)x_j - (2\zeta + 1))^{3n-k+1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{2n} ((\zeta + 2)x_j - (2\zeta + 1))^{n+k+1} \quad (2.49) \\ &\quad \times T\left( \frac{(1 - \zeta)x_1}{(\zeta + 2)x_1 - (2\zeta + 1)}, \dots, \dots, \frac{(1 - \zeta)x_{2n}}{(\zeta + 2)x_{2n} - (2\zeta + 1)}; -\frac{\zeta}{\zeta + 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding symmetries of the polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  permute the indices  $k_j$ .

**Corollary 2.18.** *The polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}
& T_n^{(k_0, k_1, k_2, k_3)}(x_1, \dots, x_m; \zeta) \\
&= \zeta^{2n(n-1)} \prod_{j=0}^3 \xi_j^{k_j(n-1)} \prod_{j=1}^m x_j^{n-1} T_n^{(k_1, k_0, k_2, k_3)}(x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}; \zeta^{-1}) \\
&= \left( \frac{\zeta - 1}{\zeta + 2} \right)^{n(n-1)} \\
&\quad \times T_n^{(k_2, k_1, k_0, k_3)} \left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)x_1 - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}, \dots, \frac{(\zeta + 2)x_m - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}; -\zeta - 1 \right) \\
&= \left( \frac{\zeta + 2}{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)} \right)^{n(n-1)} \prod_{j=0}^3 \xi_j^{k_j(n-1)} \prod_{j=1}^m x_j^{n-1} \\
&\quad \times T_n^{(k_1, k_0, k_3, k_2)} \left( \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x_1}, \dots, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta + 1)}{(\zeta + 2)x_m}; \zeta \right). \tag{2.50}
\end{aligned}$$

This is straight-forward to check using (2.37), (2.47) and Proposition 2.17.

For the next result, we will need the following Lemma, which reflects the fact that  $\sigma$  commutes with multiplication by  $e^{-6\pi iz}\theta(e^{12\pi iz}; p^6)$ .

**Lemma 2.19.** *If  $\hat{\sigma}_n$  denotes the operator defined in Lemma 2.9, then*

$$\hat{\sigma}_{n+2} Y \hat{\sigma}_n = -3XY,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
X(x) &= (x - 2\zeta - 1)((\zeta + 2)x - \zeta)((\zeta + 2)x - \zeta(2\zeta + 1))(x - 1) \\
&= (\zeta + 2)^2 \prod_{j=0}^3 (x - \xi_j), \\
Y(x) &= x((\zeta + 2)x - (2\zeta + 1))(x - \zeta) = (\zeta + 2)(x - \eta_0)(x - \eta_2)(x - \eta_3). \tag{2.51}
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Writing  $x = x(z)$ , it follows from (2.16) that

$$Y(x) \sim \frac{e^{-6\pi iz}\theta(e^{12\pi iz}; p^6)}{e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2)\theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^4} \tag{2.52}$$

$$X(x)Y(x) \sim \frac{e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2)e^{-6\pi iz}\theta(e^{12\pi iz}; p^6)}{\theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^8}. \tag{2.53}$$

With  $f$  as in (2.19), we have

$$(\sigma f)(z) \sim \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{3n}(\hat{\sigma}_n P)(x).$$

Combining this with (2.52) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2)\theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{3n+4}Y(x)(\hat{\sigma}_n P)(x) \\
& \sim e^{-6\pi iz}\theta(e^{12\pi iz}; p^6)(\sigma f)(z), \tag{2.54}
\end{aligned}$$

which is an element of  $\Theta_{n+2}$ . We now apply  $\sigma$  to (2.54). Using (2.53) and the fact that  $\sigma$  commutes with multiplication by  $1/3$ -periodic functions, we find that

$$\hat{\sigma}_{n+2}Y\hat{\sigma}_nP \sim \frac{e^{-2\pi iz}\theta(e^{4\pi iz};p^2)e^{-6\pi iz}\theta(e^{12\pi iz};p^6)}{\theta(\omega pe^{\pm 2\pi iz};p^2)^8}P \sim XYP.$$

Thus, for some constant  $C$ ,  $\sigma_{n+2}Y\hat{\sigma}_n = CXY$ .

To identify the constant, we apply the relation to  $P_1^{(n)}$ , where we indicate the  $n$ -dependence of the polynomials (2.24). By the previous discussion, we can expand

$$Ye_0P_1^{(n)} = Y\hat{\sigma}_nP_1^{(n)} = \sum_{j=1}^{2n+4} c_j P_j^{(n+2)}.$$

Since, at  $x = 0$ , the left-hand side has a single zero, and  $P_j^{(n+2)}$  a zero of degree  $j - 1$ , we must have  $c_1 = 0$  and  $c_2 = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} Ye_0P_1^{(n)} / P_2^{(n+2)}$ . We then have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{CXY P_1^{(n)}}{x} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_2 e_1 P_2^{(n+2)}}{x} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{Ye_0 e_1 P_1^{(n)}}{x},$$

which gives  $C = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} e_0 e_1 / X = -3$ .  $\square$

Lemma 2.19 implies another symmetry relation for the polynomials  $T$ . The conceptual reason is that multiplication with  $e^{-6\pi iz}\theta(e^{12\pi iz};p^6)$  defines an isomorphism from  $\Theta_n$  to the subspace of  $\sigma\Theta_{n+2}$  consisting of functions vanishing at the lattice (2.8). Thus, the alternants of the two spaces should be proportional. Applying  $\sigma$  to some of the variables and uniformizing leads to the following identity, except for the identification of the  $\zeta$ -dependent factor.

**Proposition 2.20.** *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} & T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}, \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \\ &= -\frac{3^{n-k+1}(2\zeta(\zeta+1))^{4n+6}(\zeta-1)^2(2\zeta+1)^2}{(\zeta+2)^{2n+2k+4}} \prod_{j=1}^{2n} Y(x_j) \\ & \quad T(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}; x_1, \dots, x_k), \end{aligned}$$

with  $Y$  is as in (2.51).

*Proof.* We first prove the case  $k = 2n$ , that is,

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}; \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = C_n \prod_{j=1}^{2n} Y(x_j) T(-; x_1, \dots, x_{2n}), \quad (2.55)$$

where

$$C_n = -\frac{(2\zeta(\zeta+1))^{4n+6}(\zeta-1)^2(2\zeta+1)^2}{3^{n-1}(\zeta+2)^{6n+4}}.$$

We prove this by induction on  $n$ , using the recursions of Lemma 2.13. Having verified (2.55) for  $n = 0$  and  $n = 1$ , we start from (2.36a) with  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{2n})$ ,

$\mathbf{y} = (\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ . Applying (2.55), the right-hand side of (2.36a) becomes  $C_{n+1}^2$  times the right-hand side of (2.36d), with  $\mathbf{y}$  replaced by  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  replaced by  $\emptyset$ . Since  $T(-; \mathbf{x})$  does not vanish identically, this proves (2.55), where  $C_{n+2}C_n = C_{n+1}^2$ , that is,  $C_n = C_0(C_1/C_0)^n$ .

We now multiply (2.55) by  $\Delta(\mathbf{x})$  and apply  $\hat{\sigma}$  to the variables  $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n$ . Writing  $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'' = (x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n})$ , the left-hand side becomes

$$(\zeta + 2)^{-2(2n-k)} \Delta(\mathbf{x}') \Delta(\mathbf{x}'') \prod_{i=k+1}^{2n} X(x_i) T(\mathbf{x}'; \mathbf{x}'', \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$$

and the right-hand side, using also Lemma 2.19,

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^k C_n \Delta(\mathbf{x}') \prod_{i=1}^k Y(x_i) \prod_{i=k+1}^{2n} (\hat{\sigma}_{x_i} Y(x_i) \hat{\sigma}_{x_i}) \Delta(\mathbf{x}'') T(\mathbf{x}''; \mathbf{x}') \\ = C_n 3^{2n-k} \Delta(\mathbf{x}') \Delta(\mathbf{x}'') \prod_{i=1}^{2n} Y(x_i) \prod_{i=k+1}^n X(x_i) T(\mathbf{x}''; \mathbf{x}'). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

If we start from the quantity

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_k, \xi_1, \xi_2; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}, \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3),$$

we may either apply Proposition 2.20, or use Lemma 2.10 twice to cancel the variables specialized to  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$ . After simplification, we obtain the following identity. It is less symmetric than Proposition 2.20 but will be useful for our purposes.

**Corollary 2.21.** *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} T(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}, \xi_0, \xi_3) &= \frac{3^{n-k} (\zeta + 2)^{6n-2k+2}}{\zeta^{4n+2}} \prod_{j=1}^{2n} \frac{x_j(x_j - \zeta)}{(\zeta + 2)x_j - (2\zeta + 1)} \\ &\quad \times T(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{2n}; x_1, \dots, x_k, \xi_1, \xi_2). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.20 yields an additional involution symmetry of the polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$ , but only for  $|\mathbf{k}| = 2n$ .

**Corollary 2.22.** *For  $|\mathbf{k}| = 2n$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{(\mathbf{k})} &= \frac{(-1)^{n+1} (\zeta + 2)^{2(k_1+k_2+n+2)}}{12^{n+1} \zeta^{2(k_1+k_2+2n+3)} (\zeta - 1)^{2(k_2+k_3+1)} (\zeta + 1)^{2(k_0+k_1+2n+3)} (2\zeta + 1)^{2(k_0+k_2+1)}} \\ &\quad \times T_{-n-2}^{(-k_0-1, -k_1-1, -k_2-1, -k_3-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We first apply Lemma 2.15 with  $l_j = \max(k_j + 1, 0)$  and then (2.37). This gives

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})} = \frac{(-1)^{\binom{|1-\mathbf{k}|}{2}}}{2^{|1-\mathbf{k}|} \prod_{i,j=0}^3 G(\xi_i, \xi_j)^{l_i(l_j-k_j)}} T(\xi^1; \xi^{1-\mathbf{k}}).$$

Since  $l_j - k_j \geq 1$ , we can apply Proposition 2.20. This results in an elementary prefactor times  $T(\xi^{\mathbf{m}^+}; \xi^{\mathbf{m}^-})$ , where  $m_j = -k_j - 1$ . We conclude that

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})} = \frac{(-1)^{n+1}(\zeta - 1)^2(2\zeta + 1)^2(\zeta + 2)^{2n}}{12^{n+1}(\zeta(\zeta + 1))^{2(2n+1)}} \times \prod_{j=0}^3 \left( \frac{1}{Y(\xi_j)^{k_j+1}} \left( \frac{(2\zeta(\zeta + 1))^4 Y(\xi_j)^2}{(\zeta + 2)^4 \prod_{i=0}^3 G(\xi_i, \xi_j)} \right)^{l_j} \right) T_{-n-2}^{(\mathbf{m})}.$$

After verifying that the factor raised to  $l_j$  is identically 1, and inserting the explicit factorization of  $Y(\xi_j)$ , we arrive at the desired result.  $\square$

### 3. THE TRIGONOMETRIC CUSP $\zeta = -2$

In this Section, we will consider the behaviour of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  at the trigonometric cusp  $\zeta = -2$  (or, equivalently,  $\tau = i\infty$ ,  $p = 0$ ). A careful investigation of this limit will lead to a proof of Theorem 2.3. Note that the behaviour at the other two trigonometric cusps can be deduced using the symmetries of Corollary 2.18.

**3.1. Polynomials related to symplectic and orthogonal characters.** For  $n$  a non-negative integer, let  $V_n$  be the space of Laurent polynomials  $f(t)$  satisfying

$$f(t^{-1}) = -f(t), \quad f(t) + f(\omega t) + f(\omega^2 t) = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

such that  $t^{n+[(n-1)/2]}f(t)$  is regular at  $t = 0$ . A natural basis for  $V_n$  consists of the polynomials  $t^{-m} - t^m$ , where  $1 \leq m \leq n + [(n-1)/2]$  and  $m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  or, equivalently,  $m = j + [(j-1)/2]$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . In particular,  $\dim(V_n) = n$ . Note that, when  $p = 0$ , (2.5) is an element of  $V_{2n}$ , where the variables are related by  $t = e^{2\pi iz}$ . Thus,  $V_{2n}$  appears as the trigonometric limit of  $\Theta_n$ .

In terms of the variable  $t$ , the map (2.7) takes the form

$$(\sigma f)(t) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} (f(\omega t) - f(\omega^2 t)),$$

that is,

$$\sigma(t^m) = \begin{cases} -t^m, & m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \\ t^m, & m \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

It is a bijection from  $V_n$  to the space of Laurent polynomials satisfying

$$f(t^{-1}) = f(t), \quad f(t) + f(\omega t) + f(\omega^2 t) = 0,$$

such that  $t^{n+[(n-1)/2]}f(t)$  is regular at  $t = 0$ .

The one-dimensional space  $(\text{id}^k \otimes \sigma^{n-k})V_n$  is spanned by  $\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}(X_{ij})$ , where

$$X_{ij} = \begin{cases} t_i^{-(j+[(j-1)/2])} - t_i^{j+[(j-1)/2]}, & 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ t_i^{-j-[(j-1)/2]} + t_i^{j+[(j-1)/2]}, & k+1 \leq i \leq n, \text{ } j \text{ odd}, \\ -t_i^{-j-[(j-1)/2]} - t_i^{j+[(j-1)/2]}, & k+1 \leq i \leq n, \text{ } j \text{ even}. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Since the determinant vanishes if  $t_i^2 = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  or if  $t_i = t_j^\pm$ , where  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$  or  $k+1 \leq i < j \leq n$ , it is natural to define

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n) \\ &= \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}(X_{ij})}{\prod_{i=1}^k t_i^{-k}(1-t_i^2) \prod_{i=k+1}^n t_i^{1-n+k} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k \text{ or } k+1 \leq i < j \leq n} (t_i - t_j)(1 - t_i t_j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which is a polynomial in the variables  $t_j + t_j^{-1}$ , and symmetric in its first  $k$  and its last  $n-k$  variables.

Recall [FuH] that the characters of the symplectic and even orthogonal groups are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_\lambda^{\text{sp}(2n)}(t_1, \dots, t_n) &= \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( t_i^{-(\lambda_j + n - j + 1)} - t_i^{\lambda_j + n - j + 1} \right)}{\prod_{i=1}^n t_i^{-n}(1-t_i^2) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (t_j - t_i)(1 - t_i t_j)}, \\ \chi_\lambda^{\text{o}(2n)}(t_1, \dots, t_n) &= \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( t_i^{-(\lambda_j + n - j)} + t_i^{\lambda_j + n - j} \right)}{C \prod_{i=1}^n t_i^{1-n} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (t_j - t_i)(1 - t_i t_j)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is a partition,  $C = 2$  if  $\lambda_n = 0$  and  $C = 1$  else. It is easy to check that

$$\chi(t_1, \dots, t_n; -) = \chi_{\left[\frac{n-1}{2}\right], \left[\frac{n-2}{2}\right], \dots, 1, 1, 0, 0}^{\text{sp}(2n)}(t_1, \dots, t_n), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\chi(-; t_1, \dots, t_n) = (-1)^{[n/2]} \chi_{\left[\frac{n+1}{2}\right], \left[\frac{n}{2}\right], \dots, 2, 2, 1, 1}^{\text{o}(2n)}(t_1, \dots, t_n). \quad (3.6)$$

Indeed, compared to (3.4), the order of the columns is reversed, which is compensated for by the change of sign in the factor  $t_i - t_j$  in the denominator. In the case of (3.6), we also multiply the even rows by  $-1$ , and the number of such rows is  $[n/2]$ . It follows that

$$\chi(1^{(n)}; -) > 0, \quad (-1)^{[n/2]} \chi(-; 1^{(n)}) > 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Indeed, these numbers are the dimension of the corresponding representation space, given explicitly by Weyl's dimension formula.

We state some useful properties of the polynomials  $\chi$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *The polynomials  $\chi$  satisfy*

$$\chi(-t_1, \dots, -t_k; -t_{k+1}, \dots, -t_n) = \pm \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n),$$

where the sign is negative if and only if  $n \equiv 2k+1 \pmod{4}$ .

*Proof.* Replacing all the variables by their negative, the  $j$ :th column in (3.3) changes sign if  $j + [(j-1)/2]$  is odd. The number of such columns is odd unless  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ . Moreover, the denominator in (3.4) is multiplied by  $(-1)^{k + \binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2}}$ , which is positive if and only if  $n \equiv 0$  or  $n \equiv 2k + 1 \pmod{4}$ .  $\square$

If  $f$  satisfies (3.1), then  $(\sigma f)(-1) = (2i/\sqrt{3})f(-\omega)$ . This implies the following result.

**Lemma 3.2.** *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n, -1) \\ &= -\frac{2 \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t_i - t_i^{-1})}{\prod_{i=k+1}^n t_i^{-1} (1 + t_i)^2} \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k, -\omega; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

The following closely related identities can be viewed as trigonometric limits of Proposition 2.20.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The polynomials  $\chi$  satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n, 1, -1) \\ &= (-1)^{[n/2] + k(n-k)} 2 \prod_{j=1}^n (t_j^2 + t_j^{-2} + 1) \chi(t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n; t_1, \dots, t_k), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n, 1) \\ &= (-1)^{[n/2] + k(n-k) + 1} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{t_j + t_j^{-1} - 1}{t_j + t_j^{-1} + 1} \chi(t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n; t_1, \dots, t_k, -1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

*Proof.* We first prove the case  $k = n$  of (3.9), that is,

$$\chi(-; t_1, \dots, t_n, 1, -1) = (-1)^{[n/2]} 2 \prod_{j=1}^n (t_j^2 + t_j^{-2} + 1) \chi(t_1, \dots, t_n; -). \quad (3.11)$$

Clearing denominators, this identity takes the form

$$\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n+2} \left( X_{ij}^{(1)} \right) = (-1)^{[n/2] + 1} 8 \prod_{j=1}^n (t_j^{-3} - t_j^3) \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( X_{ij}^{(2)} \right), \quad (3.12)$$

where  $X^{(1)}$  and  $X^{(2)}$  are the special cases of (3.3) corresponding to the left-hand and right-hand sides of (3.11). We note that the Laurent polynomial  $\prod_{j=1}^n (t_j^{-3} - t_j^3)$  divides the left-hand side of (3.12). Indeed, if  $t_j$  is a sixth root of unity, then the  $j$ :th row of  $X^{(1)}$  is equal to one of the last two rows. It is then straight-forward to check that the quotient is in the one-dimensional space  $V_n^{\wedge n}$ , so that (3.12) holds up to a multiplicative constant. To identify the constant, we compute the coefficient of  $\prod_{j=1}^n t_j^{-(j + [(j-1)/2] + 3)}$  for the two sides. On the right-hand side, only

the diagonal entries in  $X^{(2)}$  contribute, so the coefficient is  $(-1)^{[n/2]+1}8$ . On the left-hand side, we get a contribution from the diagonal in the upper left  $n \times n$ -block, and from the complementary  $2 \times 2$ -minor. This yields a factor  $(-1)$  from the entry  $X_{jj}^{(1)}$  when  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $j$  even, contributing in total  $(-1)^{[n/2]}$ . Moreover,  $\det_{n+1 \leq i, j \leq n+2}(X_{ij}^{(1)}) = -8$ . This completes the proof of (3.11). Applying  $\sigma$  to the last  $n - k$  variables in (3.12) yields (3.9). The proof of (3.10) is similar and we do not give the details.  $\square$

**3.2. Trigonometric limits.** The following result gives an explicit relation between the polynomials  $T$  and  $\chi$ . Note that the relation  $x_j = -(1 + t_j + t_j^{-1})$  between the variables is natural since  $x(z) = -(1 + e^{2\pi iz} + e^{-2\pi iz})$  when  $p = 0$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $k, l, m, n$  and  $N$  be non-negative integers with  $0 \leq k \leq m$ ,  $0 \leq l \leq n$  and  $m + n = 2N$ . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -2} \left( \frac{\zeta + 2}{6} \right)^{n(2N+k)-l(2k+n)+(2l-n)(N-1)-\delta(2l-n-1)} \\ & \quad \times T \left( x_1, \dots, x_k, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)y_1}, \dots, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)y_l}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. x_{k+1}, \dots, x_m, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)y_{l+1}}, \dots, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)y_n} \right) \\ & = (-1)^{kl+k+l+m} 2^{N(N-1)} 6^{m+n-k-l} \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j=1}^l \frac{1}{(1+u_j+u_j^{-1})^{N+m+n-k-l-1}} \prod_{j=l+1}^n \frac{1}{(1+u_j+u_j^{-1})^{N+k+l+1}} \\ & \quad \times \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_m) \chi(u_1, \dots, u_l; u_{l+1}, \dots, u_n), \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where  $x_j = -(1 + t_j + t_j^{-1})$ ,  $y_j = -(1 + u_j + u_j^{-1})$  and  $\delta(N) = [N^2/4]$ .

*Proof.* We start from (2.31), where  $n$  should be replaced by  $N$ . We permute the rows so that the  $i$ :th row involves the variable  $x_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $y_{i-m}$  for  $m+1 \leq i \leq m+n$ . To the last  $n$  rows, we apply the identities

$$\begin{aligned} P_j \left( \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)x} \right) &= (-1)^{N+1} \zeta^{N-1+[j/2]} \left( \frac{2\zeta+1}{\zeta+2} \right)^{j-1+[j/2]} \frac{1}{x^{3N-2}} P_{2N+1-j}(x), \\ e_j \left( \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)x} \right) &= -\frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)x^2} e_{1-j}(x). \end{aligned}$$

(These can be understood in terms of the map  $z \mapsto z + \tau/2$ , cf. Lemma 2.6.)

Let  $\rho_j = j - 1 + [(j-1)/2]$  and  $\xi = \zeta(2\zeta+1)/(\zeta+2)$ . We pull out the factor  $\xi^{\rho_m}$  from the  $i$ :th row when  $m+1 \leq i \leq m+l$ ,  $\xi^{\rho_{m+1}}$  from the  $i$ :th row when  $m+l+1 \leq i \leq m+n$  and  $\xi^{\rho_j - \rho_m}$  from the  $j$ :th column, when  $m+1 \leq j \leq m+n$ . At the point  $\zeta = -2$ , the resulting matrix is regular with the upper right  $n \times m$

block vanishing. Thus, the determinant factors as the product of the diagonal blocks.

Let

$$T^{\text{trig}}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) = \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}(Y_{ij})}{\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) \Delta(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)},$$

where

$$Y_{ij} = \begin{cases} P_j^{\text{trig}}(x_i), & 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ e_1^{\text{trig}}(x_i) P_j^{\text{trig}}(x_i), & k+1 \leq i \leq n, \text{ } j \text{ even}, \\ e_0^{\text{trig}}(x_i) P_j^{\text{trig}}(x_i), & k+1 \leq i \leq n, \text{ } j \text{ odd}, \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

with

$$P_j^{\text{trig}}(x) = 2^{[(j+1)/2]-N} P_j(x) \Big|_{\zeta=-2} = x^{j-1} (x+3)^{[\frac{j-1}{2}]},$$

$$e_0^{\text{trig}}(x) = \frac{1}{6} e_0(x) \Big|_{\zeta=-2} = -x-1, \quad e_1^{\text{trig}}(x) = \frac{1}{6} e_1(x) \Big|_{\zeta=-2} = x+3.$$

After straight-forward simplification, we find that the left-hand side of (3.13) equals

$$(-1)^{kl+n(k+l+N)} 2^{N(N-1)} 6^{m+n-k-l} \prod_{j=1}^l (-y_j)^{k+l+1-m-n-N} \prod_{j=l+1}^n (-y_j)^{-k-l-1-N} \\ \times T^{\text{trig}}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_m) T^{\text{trig}}(y_1, \dots, y_l; y_{l+1}, \dots, y_n). \quad (3.15)$$

We now observe that, with  $x = -1 - t - t^{-1}$ ,

$$(t^{-1} - t) P_j^{\text{trig}}(x) = \begin{cases} (t^{-1} - t)(2 - t^3 - t^{-3})^{\frac{j-1}{2}}, & j \text{ odd}, \\ (t^2 - t^{-2} + t - t^{-1})(2 - t^3 - t^{-3})^{\frac{j-2}{2}}, & j \text{ even}, \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

which is an element of  $V_j \setminus V_{j-1}$ . Thus, for some constant  $C_n$ ,

$$\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( (t_i^{-1} - t_i) P_j^{\text{trig}}(x_i) \right) = C_n \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( t_i^{-j-[(j-1)/2]} - t_i^{j+[(j-1)/2]} \right). \quad (3.17)$$

Identifying the coefficient of  $\prod_{i=1}^n t_i^{-i-[(i-1)/2]}$  gives  $C_n = \prod_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1+[(i-1)/2]}$ , that is,  $C_n = -1$  when  $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$  and  $C_n = 1$  else.

Next, we observe that

$$P_j^{\text{trig}}(x) e_0^{\text{trig}}(x) = (t + t^{-1})(2 - t^3 - t^{-3})^{\frac{j-1}{2}}, \quad j \text{ odd},$$

$$P_j^{\text{trig}}(x) e_1^{\text{trig}}(x) = (t^2 + t^{-2} - t - t^{-1})(2 - t^3 - t^{-3})^{\frac{j-2}{2}}, \quad j \text{ even},$$

which, by (3.2) and (3.16), equals  $\sigma((t^{-1} - t) P_j^{\text{trig}}(x))$ . Thus, applying  $\sigma$  to the last  $n - k$  rows in (3.17) gives

$$\prod_{i=1}^k (t_i^{-1} - t_i) \det(Y) = C_n \det(X),$$

where  $X$  and  $Y$  are as in (3.3) and (3.14). Using also

$$\Delta(x_1, \dots, x_k) = (-1)^{\binom{k}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^k t_i^{1-k} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (t_i - t_j)(1 - t_i t_j),$$

it follows that

$$T^{\text{trig}}(x_1, \dots, x_k; x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n) = C_n(-1)^{\binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2}} \chi(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_n).$$

Inserting this in (3.15) and simplifying completes the proof.  $\square$

Applying Proposition 3.4 to (2.37) leads after simplification to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -2} \left( \frac{\zeta + 2}{6} \right)^{(k_1 + k_2)(n-1) - \delta(k_1 + k_2 - 1)} T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x) \\ &= (-1)^{\binom{|\mathbf{k}^-|}{2} + |\mathbf{k}^-|(k_1^+ + k_2^+) + k_0^- + k_3^- + k_2(n-1)} 2^{n(n-1) - |\mathbf{k}^-|} 3^{|\mathbf{k}^-| - k_1(n-1)} \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{x_j^{2k_0^-} (x_j + 2)^{2k_3^-}} \\ & \quad \times \chi \left( t_1, \dots, t_m, 1^{(k_0^+)}, (-1)^{(k_3^+)}; 1^{(k_0^-)}, (-1)^{(k_3^-)} \right) \\ & \quad \times \chi \left( 1^{(k_1^+)}, (-1)^{(k_2^+)}; 1^{(k_1^-)}, (-1)^{(k_2^-)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

**3.3. Non-vanishing character values.** The key fact for proving Theorem 2.3 is that  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  does not vanish identically. By (3.18) and the fact that  $k_j^+ k_j^- = 0$ , this would follow from the non-vanishing of the quantities

$$\chi \left( 1^{(k)}, (-1)^{(l)}; - \right), \quad (3.19a)$$

$$\chi \left( 1^{(k)}; (-1)^{(l)} \right), \quad (3.19b)$$

$$\chi \left( (-1)^{(k)}; 1^{(l)} \right), \quad (3.19c)$$

$$\chi \left( -; 1^{(k)}, (-1)^{(l)} \right). \quad (3.19d)$$

By Lemma 3.1, (3.19c) can be reduced to (3.19b). Moreover, by (3.9), if  $k, l \geq 1$  (3.19d) can be reduced to (3.19a). The non-vanishing of (3.19d) when  $l = 0$  follows from (3.7), and the case  $k = 0$  then follows using Lemma 3.1. In conclusion, the non-vanishing of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  would follow from the non-vanishing of (3.19a) and (3.19b).

To investigate these two cases, we will use the following trigonometric limits of the recursions (2.36).

**Lemma 3.5.** *The polynomial  $\chi$  satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(a-b)(1-ab)}{ab} \chi(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{u}) \chi(\mathbf{t}, a, b, c; \mathbf{u}) \\ &= g(b, c) \chi(\mathbf{t}, a, c; \mathbf{u}) \chi(\mathbf{t}, b; \mathbf{u}) - g(a, c) \chi(\mathbf{t}, a; \mathbf{u}) \chi(\mathbf{t}, b, c; \mathbf{u}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.20a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{u})\chi(\mathbf{t}, a, c; \mathbf{u}, b) &= \frac{(c-b)(1-bc)}{bc} g(b, c)\chi(\mathbf{t}, a, c; \mathbf{u})\chi(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{u}, b) \\ &\quad - g(a, c)\chi(\mathbf{t}, a; \mathbf{u})\chi(\mathbf{t}, c; \mathbf{u}, b). \end{aligned} \quad (3.20b)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{t}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  are (possibly empty) vectors,  $a, b, c, d$  scalars and

$$g(t, u) = \left( tu + 1 + \frac{1}{tu} \right) \left( \frac{t}{u} + 1 + \frac{u}{t} \right).$$

*Proof.* To prove (3.20a), we let

$$\mathbf{x} = \left( x_1, \dots, x_k, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)w_1}, \dots, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)w_l} \right)$$

and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$  in (2.36a). Then,  $k + l + m = 2N$  is even. We replace  $d$  by  $\zeta(2\zeta+1)/(\zeta+2)d$ , multiply both sides with  $(\zeta+2)^{(2l+1)(N+m)+2-\delta(l-1)-\delta(l)}$  and let  $\zeta \rightarrow -2$ . Using Proposition 3.4 and

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -2} G(-1-t-t^{-1}, -1-u-u^{-1}) = 2g(t, u),$$

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -2} \left( \frac{\zeta+2}{6} \right)^2 G\left(x, \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)y}\right) = \frac{2}{y^2},$$

we find that all factors involving the variables  $w_j$  and  $d$  can be cancelled. After simplification and a change of variables we obtain (3.20a). The identity (3.20b) is proved in the same way starting from (2.36c).  $\square$

The only role of the parameters  $w_j$  in the proof of Lemma 3.5 is to allow for any parity of the length of the vectors  $\mathbf{t}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$ . Thus, it would be enough to consider the cases  $l = 0$  and  $l = 1$ .

For the next result, we use the notation [R3]

$$\phi_n(x) = {}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix} -n/2, -(n-1)/2 \\ n+3/2 \end{matrix}; x\right), \quad (3.21)$$

$$\psi_n(x) = {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} -n/2, -(n+1)/2, (n+5)/4 \\ n+3/2, (n+1)/4 \end{matrix}; x\right).$$

Note that  $\phi_n$  and  $\psi_n$  are polynomials in  $x$  with positive coefficients.

**Proposition 3.6.** *When all but one variable is specialized to 1, the symplectic character (3.5) is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} &\chi(t, 1^{(n)}; -) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{3^{n(n+2)/4}}{4^n} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n/2} (6j+2)(6j-1)!(2j)!}{\prod_{j=1}^n (2j+1)!} \left( \frac{(1+t)^2}{t} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \psi_n(y), & n \text{ even}, \\ \frac{3^{(n-1)(n+1)/4}}{4^{n-1}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{(n-1)/2} (6j+4)!(2j)!}{\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (2j+3)!} \left( \frac{(1+t)^2}{t} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \phi_n(y), & n \text{ odd}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

where  $y = -(t-1)^2/3(t+1)^2$ .

*Proof.* In (3.20a), we let  $\mathbf{t} = 1^{(n)}$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = \emptyset$ ,  $a = t$  and  $b = c = 1$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{(t-1)^2}{t} \chi(1^{(n)}; -) \chi(t, 1^{(n+2)}; -) \\ & = 9\chi(1^{(n+1)}; -) \chi(t, 1^{(n+1)}; -) - (1+t+t^{-1})^2 \chi(1^{(n+2)}; -) \chi(t, 1^{(n)}; -). \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

We need to prove that, with the initial conditions  $\chi(-; -) = \chi(t; -) = \chi(t, 1; -) = 1$ , the recursion (3.23) is solved by (3.22).

Plugging (3.22) into (3.23), using  $\phi_n(0) = \psi_n(0) = 1$ , gives after simplification for even  $n$

$$\frac{3(3n+5)(3n+8)}{(2n+3)(2n+5)} y \psi_{n+2}(y) = (3y+1)^2 \phi_{n+1}(y) - (y-1)^2 \psi_n(y)$$

and for odd  $n$

$$\frac{3(3n+4)(3n+7)}{(2n+3)(2n+5)} y \phi_{n+2}(y) = (3y+1) \psi_{n+1}(y) - (y-1)^2 \phi_n(y). \quad (3.24)$$

These identities (which are trivial to verify and hold regardless of the parity of  $n$ ) were given in [R3, Eq. (8.19–8.20)].  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the non-vanishing of (3.19a).

**Lemma 3.7.** *We have*

$$\varepsilon(k, l) \chi(1^{(k)}, (-1)^{(l)}; -) > 0,$$

where  $\varepsilon(k, l) = (-1)^{\lfloor l/2 \rfloor + 1}$  if  $l > k+1$  and  $l \equiv k+2 \pmod{4}$ , and  $\varepsilon(k, l) = (-1)^{\lfloor l/2 \rfloor}$  else.

*Proof.* Let  $X(k, l) = \chi(1^{(k)}, (-1)^{(l)}; -)$ . By Lemma 3.1,  $X(k, l) = \pm X(l, k)$ , where the sign is negative if and only if  $k+l \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , which is equivalent to  $\varepsilon(k, l)\varepsilon(l, k) = -1$ . Thus, we may assume that  $k \geq l$ . The case  $l = 0$  follows from (3.7). When  $l = 1$ , we must prove that  $\chi(1^{(k)}, -1; -) > 0$ . If we let  $t \rightarrow -1$  in (3.22), then only the highest coefficient of the polynomials  $\phi_n$  and  $\psi_n$  contribute to the limit. Since this coefficient is positive, the result follows.

Assuming from now on that  $k \geq l \geq 2$ , we choose  $\mathbf{t} = (1^{(k-1)}, (-1)^{(l-2)})$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = \emptyset$ ,  $a = 1$  and  $b = c = -1$  in (3.20a). This gives

$$4X(k-1, l-2)X(k, l) = X(k, l-2)X(k-1, l) - 9X(k, l-1)X(k-1, l-1). \quad (3.25)$$

For each of the six occurrences  $X(k', l')$  of  $X$  in (3.25), we have  $l' \leq k' + 1$ , so  $\varepsilon(k', l') = (-1)^{\lfloor l'/2 \rfloor}$ . It follows that  $\varepsilon(k, l-2)\varepsilon(k-1, l) = \varepsilon(k-1, l-2)\varepsilon(k, l) = -1$ ,  $\varepsilon(k, l-1)\varepsilon(k-1, l-1) = 1$ . Thus, the numbers  $Y(k, l) = \varepsilon(k, l)X(k, l)$  satisfy

$$4Y(k-1, l-2)Y(k, l) = Y(k, l-2)Y(k-1, l) + 9Y(k, l-1)Y(k-1, l-1),$$

which implies  $Y(k, l) > 0$  by induction on  $k+l$ .  $\square$

The recursion (3.25) can in fact be solved explicitly, leading to the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{(n,n-1,n-1,\dots,1,1,0,0)}^{\text{sp}(4n+2)}(1^{(2n+1-l)}, (-1)^{(l)}) &= (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor} 3^{\frac{1}{2}((l-n)(l-n-1)+n(n-1))} \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} \frac{(3j-2)!}{(n+j)!} \prod_{j=1}^{\max(n-l, l-n-1)} \frac{(j-1)!(6j-1)!(n+j)!(2n-2j+1)!}{(2j-1)!(3j-1)!(n-j)!(2n+2j+1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{(n-1,n-1,\dots,1,1,0,0)}^{\text{sp}(4n)}(1^{(2n-l)}, (-1)^{(l)}) &= (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{l+1}{2} \rfloor + \min(l,n)} 2^{2n+|l-n|} 3^{\frac{|l-n|(|l-n|+1)+n(n-5)}{2}} \\ &\times \frac{(3/2)_n}{(4/3)_n} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} \frac{(3j-2)!}{(n+j)!} \prod_{j=1}^{|l-n|} \frac{(j-1)!(6j-5)!(n+j-1)!(2n-2j+1)!}{(2j-2)!(3j-3)!(n-j)!(2n+2j-1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Although we have no need for these evaluations, we include them here since they may have some independent interest.

Next, we consider the quantity (3.19b).

**Lemma 3.8.** *We have*

$$\varepsilon(k, l) \chi(1^{(k)}; (-1)^{(l)}) > 0,$$

where  $\varepsilon(k, l) = (-1)^{[(l+1)/2]+kl+1}$  if  $l > k+2$  and  $l \equiv k+3 \pmod{4}$ , and  $\varepsilon(k, l) = (-1)^{[(l+1)/2]+kl}$  else.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.7. Let  $X(k, l) = \chi(1^{(k)}; (-1)^{(l)})$ . Combining Lemma 3.1 and (3.10), we deduce that  $X(k, l+1) = \pm 3^{k-l} X(l, k+1)$ , where the sign is negative if and only if  $k+l \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , which is equivalent to  $\varepsilon(k, l+1)\varepsilon(l, k+1) = -1$ . Thus, we may assume that  $k+1 \geq l$ . The case  $l=0$  follows from (3.7). When  $l=1$ , we use Lemma 3.2 to write  $\chi(1^{(k)}; -1) = (-1)^{k+1} 2\chi(1^k, -\omega; -)$ . We then apply (3.22), using that, for  $t = -\omega$ ,  $(1+t)^2/t = 3$  and  $-(t-1)^2/3(t+1)^2 = 1/9$ . Since  $\phi_n$  and  $\psi_n$  have positive coefficients, it follows that  $(-1)^{k+1}\chi(1^{(k)}; -1) > 0$ , which is the case  $l=1$ .

In remaining cases,  $k+1 \geq l \geq 2$ , we can use (3.20b) to write

$$X(k, l)X(k-1, l-2) = 4X(k, l-2)X(k-1, l) + 9X(k, l-1)X(k-1, l-1).$$

If  $X(k', l')$  is any occurrence of  $X$  in this identity, then  $k'+2 \geq l'$ . It follows that  $\varepsilon(k, l-2)\varepsilon(k-1, l) = \varepsilon(k-1, l-2)\varepsilon(k, l) = \varepsilon(k, l-1)\varepsilon(k-1, l-1) = (-1)^{l+1}$ . Thus, the numbers  $Y(k, l) = \varepsilon(k, l)X(k, l)$  satisfy

$$Y(k-1, l-2)Y(k, l) = 4Y(k, l-2)Y(k-1, l) + 9Y(k, l-1)Y(k-1, l-1),$$

which gives  $Y(k, l) > 0$  by induction on  $k+l$ .  $\square$

As was explained at the beginning of §3.3, Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.8 have the following important consequence.

**Corollary 3.9.** *The polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  never vanish identically.*

We can now prove Theorem 2.3. By general linear algebra, if  $L_1, \dots, L_M$  are linear functionals on a vector space  $V$  of dimension  $N \geq M$ , then

$$\dim \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^M \text{Ker}(L_j) \right) = N - M$$

$$\iff \left( \text{id}^{\otimes(N-M)} \otimes L_1 \otimes \dots \otimes L_M \right) V^{\wedge N} \neq \{0\}. \quad (3.26)$$

We apply this to the situation described in Lemma 2.2, where  $\Theta_n^{\mathbf{k}}$  is obtained from  $\Theta_{n+|\mathbf{k}^-|}$  by imposing a number of linear conditions. By construction (see the proof of Proposition 2.14), the space corresponding to the right side of (3.26) is spanned by (2.38). Thus, Theorem 2.3 follows from Corollary 3.9.

#### 4. THE NON-TRIGONOMETRIC CUSP $\zeta = 0$

In this section we study the behaviour of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  at  $\zeta = 0$ . This might at first seem easier than the case  $\zeta = -2$  treated in §3. For instance, at  $\zeta = 0$ ,

$$G(x, y) = 2xy(x + y - 1) + \mathcal{O}(\zeta), \quad (4.1)$$

and thus (2.27) reduces to the Cauchy determinant. It follows that

$$T(u_1, \dots, u_{2N}; -) = 2^{N(N-1)} u_1^{N-1} \dots u_{2N}^{N-1} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta), \quad (4.2)$$

which is more elementary than the symplectic character appearing for  $\zeta = -2$ . However, the behaviour of  $T$  is more complicated when some variables are specialized to  $\xi_1$  or  $\xi_2$ , which tend to 0 as  $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ . In fact, we have only been able to determine the behaviour when  $k_0 + k_3 \geq n$  or  $m = 0$ , see Corollary 4.4 and Corollary 4.5, respectively. The general case is described in Conjecture 4.6.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $k, l, m, n, N$  be non-negative integers with  $k + l + m + n = 2N$  and let*

$$M = l(2N - l - 1) + n(2N - n + 1). \quad (4.3)$$

*Then, as a polynomial in  $\zeta$ ,*

$$T \left( u_1, \dots, u_k, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 v_1, \dots, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 v_l; x_1, \dots, x_m, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 y_1, \dots, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 y_n \right) \quad (4.4)$$

*is divisible by  $\zeta^M$ .*

This result is sharpened in Corollary 4.3.

*Proof.* We use the determinant formula (2.31). Since  $P_j(\zeta/2 + \zeta^2 v)$  is  $\mathcal{O}(\zeta^{2N-2})$  for  $j$  odd and  $\mathcal{O}(\zeta^{2N-1})$  for  $j$  even, the  $l$  rows involving the variables  $v_j$  are divisible by  $\zeta^{2N-2}$ . Since  $e_0(\zeta/2 + \zeta^2 v) = \mathcal{O}(\zeta^2)$ ,  $e_1(\zeta/2 + \zeta^2 v) = \mathcal{O}(\zeta)$ , the  $n$  rows involving  $y_j$  are divisible by  $\zeta^{2N}$ . Thus, the numerator in (2.31) is divisible by  $\zeta^{l(2N-2)+2nN}$ . Since the denominator is  $\mathcal{O}(\zeta^{l(l-1)+n(n-1)})$ , the result follows.  $\square$

Let  $Q(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$  be the coefficient of  $\zeta^M$  in (4.4). Since  $\xi_0$  and  $\xi_3$  are  $1 + \mathcal{O}(\zeta)$  and

$$\xi_1 = \frac{\zeta}{2} - \frac{\zeta^2}{4} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3), \quad \xi_2 = \frac{\zeta}{2} + \frac{3\zeta^2}{4} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3),$$

we want to specialize the variables  $u_j$  and  $x_j$  to 1 and the variables  $v_j$  and  $y_j$  to  $-1/4$  or  $3/4$ . For  $r + s = l$ ,  $t + u = n$ , we will write

$$C(k; r, s; m; t, u) = Q(1^{(k)}; (-1/4)^{(r)}, (3/4)^{(s)}; 1^{(m)}; (-1/4)^{(t)}, (3/4)^{(u)}). \quad (4.5)$$

**Lemma 4.2.** *The quantity (4.5) is non-zero if and only if*

$$(N - l - m)(N + 1 - m - n) \geq 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Moreover, if (4.6) holds, then (4.5) has the same sign as

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{[(l+m)/2] + kn + lm + (r+t)(N+l+m)}, & t \leq r, \ u \leq s, \ m \leq k+1 \\ & & \text{or } t \geq r+1, \ u \geq s+1, \ m \geq k+1, \\ & (-1)^{[(m+n)/2] + k+m + (r+t)(N+m+n+1)}, & t \leq r, \ u \leq s, \ m \geq k+1 \\ & & \text{or } t \geq r+1, \ u \geq s+1, \ m \leq k+1, \\ & (-1)^{[(m+r+u)/2] + k+m + (r+t)N}, & t \leq r, \ u \geq s+1, \ m+r+u \leq k+s+t, \\ & & \text{or } t \geq r+1, \ u \leq s, \\ & & k+s+t+2 \leq m+r+u, \\ & (-1)^{[N/2] + k+m + (m+n+1)N}, & t \geq r+1, \ u \leq s, \ m \geq k+1, \\ & & m+r+u \leq k+s+t, \\ & & \text{or } t \leq r, \ u \geq s+1, \ m \leq k+1, \\ & & k+s+t+2 \leq m+r+u, \\ & (-1)^{[(m+s+t)/2] + kn + lm + (r+t)N}, & t \geq r+1, \ u \leq s, \ m+s+t \leq k+r+u, \\ & & \text{or } t \leq r, \ u \geq s+1, \\ & & k+r+u+2 \leq m+s+t, \\ & (-1)^{[N/2] + kn + lm + (m+l+1)N}, & t \leq r, \ u \geq s+1, \ m \geq k+1, \\ & & m+s+t \leq k+r+u, \\ & & \text{or } t \geq r+1, \ u \leq s, \ m \leq k+1, \\ & & k+r+u+2 \leq m+s+t. \end{aligned}$$

The main point of Lemma 4.2 is the condition (4.6) for non-vanishing of (4.5). The conditions for positivity and negativity of (4.5) are less interesting, but they are used to prove sufficiency of (4.6).

We remark that each of the six conditions given for the sign holds for a larger range of parameters. For instance, in the third condition  $t \leq r$ ,  $u \geq s+1$ ,  $m+r+u \leq k+s+t$  can be replaced by  $t \leq r+1$ ,  $u \geq s$ ,  $m+r+u \leq k+s+t+2$ . In order to avoid tedious verification that the expressions for the sign agree in

the overlaps, we have formulated Lemma 4.2 so that these overlaps are as small as possible, subject to the condition that the symmetry (4.11) below is explicitly displayed.

Let us now turn to the proof of Lemma 4.2. We first check that the statement is non-ambiguous, in the sense that the given expressions for the sign agree in the overlaps between the six parameter regimes. Note that in the third and fifth regime, the first of the two conditions implies  $m \leq k - 1$  and the second one  $m \geq k + 3$ . Thus, the regimes can only overlap when  $m = k + 1$ . Then, (4.6) reduces to  $-(n - l - 1)^2 \geq 0$ , that is,  $n = l + 1$ , which is impossible for the first two regimes. In conclusion, the only overlap is between the fourth and sixth regime, when  $m = k + 1$  and  $n = l + 1$ . It is then easy to check that

$$k + m + nN + 2k(l - 1) = kn + lm + lN,$$

which implies that the two given expression agree.

Next, we prove the “only if” part of Lemma 4.2. To this end, we replace  $u_j$  and  $x_j$  in (4.4) by  $1 + \zeta u_j$  and  $1 + \zeta x_j$ , and then apply the symmetry (2.48c). We find that, as  $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & T \left( 1 + \zeta u_1, \dots, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 v_l; 1 + \zeta x_1, \dots, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 y_n \right) \\ & \sim \left( \frac{2}{\zeta} \right)^{N(N+1-n-l)+k(m-1)-n(l+1)} T \left( \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)(1+\zeta u_1)}, \dots, \frac{2\zeta+1}{(\zeta+2)(\frac{1}{2}+\zeta v_l)}; \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)(1+\zeta x_1)}, \dots, \frac{2\zeta+1}{(\zeta+2)(\frac{1}{2}+\zeta y_n)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1, the left-hand side is

$$\zeta^M Q(1^{(k)}; \mathbf{v}; 1^{(m)}; \mathbf{y}) + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^{M+1}).$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\zeta(2\zeta+1)}{(\zeta+2)(1+\zeta u)} &= \frac{\zeta}{2} + \left( \frac{3}{4} - \frac{u}{2} \right) \zeta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3), \\ \frac{2\zeta+1}{(\zeta+2)(\frac{1}{2}+\zeta v)} &= 1 + \left( \frac{3}{2} - 2v \right) \zeta + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^2), \end{aligned}$$

the right-hand side is

$$\zeta^{M'} Q \left( 1^{(l)}; \frac{3}{4} - \frac{u_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{3}{4} - \frac{u_k}{2}; 1^{(n)}; \frac{3}{4} - \frac{x_1}{2}, \dots, \frac{3}{4} - \frac{x_m}{2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^{M'+1}),$$

where

$$M' = M - (N - l - m)(N + 1 - m - n). \quad (4.7)$$

As a consequence, if (4.6) does *not* hold, then  $M' > M$ , so (4.5) is equal to zero. It also follows that if equality holds in (4.6), then

$$\begin{aligned} C(k_1 + k_2; r, s; m_1 + m_2; t, u) \\ = 2^{N(N+1-l-n)+k(m-1)-n(l+1)} C(r + s; k_1, k_2; t + u; m_1, m_2), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

for any decompositions  $k = k_1 + k_2$ ,  $m = m_1 + m_2$  as sums of non-negative integers.

It remains to prove Lemma 4.2 under the condition (4.6). We will use induction on  $N$ . The proof is divided into a number of cases, where each case is reduced either to instances of Lemma 4.2 with a smaller value of  $N$ , or to instances with the same value of  $N$  but corresponding to a case that will be treated later. In each step, we will assume that we are not in any of the cases treated previously.

**Case 1:**  $\min(k, m) \geq 1$ . In this case we let  $u_1 = x_1$  in (4.4), and eliminate the dependence on this variable using Lemma 2.10. Using (4.1) and

$$G\left(x, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 y\right) = \frac{x(x-1)(4y+1)+1}{2} \zeta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3), \quad (4.9)$$

it follows after simplification that

$$C(k; r, s; m; t, u) = (-1)^{k+l+1} 4^{k+m-N} C(k-1; r, s; m-1; t, u). \quad (4.10)$$

One may check that this is consistent with the statement of the lemma, so we are reduced to a lower value of  $N$ .

**Case 2:**  $\min(r, t) \geq 1$  **or**  $\min(s, u) \geq 1$ . Similarly as in Case 1, we specialize  $v_1 = y_1$  in (4.4). Using also

$$G\left(\frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 x, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 y\right) = \frac{1}{2} \zeta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3),$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned} C(k; r, s; m; t, u) &= \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{4^{N-1}} C(k, r-1, s; m; t-1, u), \\ C(k; r, s; m; t, u) &= \frac{(-1)^{k+l+1}}{4^{N-1}} C(k, r, s-1; m; t, u-1), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\min(r, t) \geq 1$  and  $\min(s, u) \geq 1$ , respectively. After checking that this is consistent with the lemma, we are reduced to a lower value of  $N$ .

**Case 3:**  $m \geq 2$ . In this case, it follows from Corollary 2.21 that

$$C(k; r, s; m; t, u) = 3^{N-1-k-l} 4^{N-2+m-l} C(m-2; t, u; k; r+1, s+1). \quad (4.11)$$

Using the identity  $(-1)^{[x/2]+[y/2]} = (-1)^{[(x+y)/2]+xy}$ , one may check that this is consistent with the lemma. Since cases with  $k > 0$  are covered by Case 1, this reduces the case  $m \geq 2$  to the case  $m = 0$ , which will be covered below.

**Case 4:**  $r < s$  **or**  $t > u$ . Starting from the symmetry (2.49), a straight-forward computation gives

$$C(k; r, s; m; t, u) = (-1)^{N(n+l)+mn+kl} C(k; s, r; m; u, t), \quad (4.12)$$

which is consistent with the lemma. If Case 4 applies to both sides of (4.12), then either  $r < s$  and  $t < u$  or  $r > s$  and  $t > u$ . These cases are covered by Case 2.

Since we assume from now on that we are neither in Case 2 nor in Case 4, one of the three conditions

$$r \geq s, \quad t = u = 0, \quad (4.13a)$$

$$u \geq t, \quad r = s = 0, \quad (4.13b)$$

$$s = t = 0 \quad (4.13c)$$

holds.

**Case 5: Equality holds in (4.6), and  $\min(l, n) \geq 1$  or  $n \geq 2$ .** The lemma states that (4.5) has the same sign as  $(-1)^{[N/2]+kn+lm}$  when  $l + m = N$  and as  $(-1)^{[N/2]+k+n+1}$  when  $m + n = N + 1$ . Applying the symmetry (4.8) we are reduced to Case 1 and Case 3, respectively.

Let us now consider cases with  $k \geq 2$ . Since we assume that we are not in Case 1, we have  $m = 0$ . Then, (4.6) is equivalent to

$$l \leq N \quad \text{and} \quad n \leq N + 1. \quad (4.14)$$

We will distinguish between the subcases  $k = 2N$ ,  $k = 2N - 1$  and  $2 \leq k \leq 2N - 2$ . In the first two cases, (4.14) holds automatically.

**Case 6:**  $k = 2N$ . By (4.2),

$$C(2N; 0, 0; 0; 0, 0) = 2^{N(N-1)}, \quad (4.15)$$

which proves the result in this case.

By (4.13), when  $k = 2N - 1$ , we have either  $r = 1$  or  $u = 1$ .

**Case 7:**  $k = 2N - 1$ ,  $r = 1$ . Lemma 4.1 gives

$$T\left(u_1, \dots, u_{2N-1}, \frac{\zeta}{2} + \zeta^2 v; -\right) = Q(\mathbf{u}; v; -; -) \zeta^{2N-2} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^{2N-1}), \quad (4.16)$$

where we must prove that

$$(-1)^{N+1} Q(1^{(2N-1)}; -1/4; -; -) > 0. \quad (4.17)$$

We first verify the case  $N = 1$ , when

$$Q(1; -1/4; 0; 0) = C(1; 1, 0; 0; 0, 0) = 1. \quad (4.18)$$

If  $N \geq 2$ , we let  $\mathbf{x} = 1^{(2N-4)}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = \emptyset$ ,  $b = c = 1$  and  $d = \zeta/2 - \zeta^2/4$  in the recursion (2.36a) and then let  $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ . By the induction hypothesis, we may use (4.2) or (4.16) for all but one occurrence of the polynomial  $T$ . Using also (4.1) and (4.9), we obtain the recursion

$$(a - 1)Q_N(a) = 4^{N-2}(a^{N-2}Q_{N-1}(1) - a^2Q_{N-1}(a)),$$

where  $Q_N(a) = Q(a, 1^{(2N-2)}; -1/4; -; -)$ . Starting from  $Q_1 = 1$ , we find that

$$Q_N(a) = (-1)^{N+1} 4^{\binom{N-1}{2}} a^{N-2} (a + N - 1), \quad (4.19)$$

in agreement with (4.17).

**Case 8:**  $k = 2N - 1$ ,  $u = 1$ . We proceed as in Case 7, but start from (2.36b) rather than (2.36a). We find that the polynomials

$$Q_N(a) = Q(a, 1^{(2N-2)}; -, -; 3/4)$$

satisfy the recursion

$$(a - 1)Q_N(a) = 4^{N-2}(a^{N-1}(2a - 1)^2Q_{N-1}(1) - a^2Q_{N-1}(a))$$

with starting value  $Q_1 = 1 - 2a$ . This is solved by

$$Q_N(a) = -4^{\binom{N-1}{2}}a^{N-1}(2a - 1),$$

which proves the result in this case.

Let us now consider the case  $2 \leq k \leq 2N - 2$ . Since  $m = 0$ , the numbers  $l + n$  and  $k$  have the same parity. We distinguish between the cases  $l + n \leq k$  and  $l + n \geq k + 2$ . Starting with the first case, we observe that (4.14) holds automatically. In view of (4.13), we may distinguish between the five cases  $r \geq 2$ ,  $u \geq 2$  and  $(r, s, t, u) = (1, 1, 0, 0)$ ,  $(0, 0, 1, 1)$  or  $(1, 0, 0, 1)$ .

**Case 9:**  $\max(2, l + n) \leq k$ ,  $r \geq 2$ . From (2.36a), we derive the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} & C(k; r, s; m; t, u)C(k - 2; r - 2, s; m; t, u) \\ &= \frac{C(k - 2; r, s; m; t, u)C(k; r - 2, s; m; t, u)}{4} - C(k - 1; r - 1, s; m; t, u)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

By (4.13), we may assume  $s = t = 0$  or  $t = u = 0$ . The lemma states that

$$(-1)^{\lfloor l/2 \rfloor + r(N+l)}C(k; r, s; 0; 0, 0) > 0, \quad (4.21a)$$

$$(-1)^{\lfloor (l+n)/2 \rfloor + k + lN}C(k; l, 0; 0; 0, n) > 0 \quad (4.21b)$$

and, more generally, that this holds as long as  $l + n \leq k + 2$  and (4.14) is true. By the induction hypothesis, it follows that in the corresponding specialization of (4.20), the first term on the right-hand side is non-positive and the second term strictly negative (the first term vanishes in the case  $(k, l, n) = (N, N, 0)$ ). Thus, the left-hand side of (4.20) is negative, which implies (4.21) by induction.

**Case 10:**  $\max(2, l + n) \leq k$ ,  $u \geq 2$ . This case is similar to Case 9. By (2.36c),

$$\begin{aligned} & C(k; r, s; m; t, u)C(k - 2; r, s; m; t, u - 2) \\ &= \frac{C(k - 2; r, s; m; t, u)C(k; r, s; m; t, u - 2)}{4} - C(k - 1; r, s; m; t, u - 1)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

We need to prove (4.21b) and

$$(-1)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + k + t(N+n+1)}C(k; 0, 0; 0; t, u) > 0.$$

Again, the lemma states that these inequalities hold as long as  $l + n \leq k + 2$  and (4.14) is true. It follows that both terms on the right-hand side of (4.22) are strictly negative, which implies the desired result by induction.

**Case 11:**  $k \geq 2$ ,  $(r, s, t, u) = (1, 1, 0, 0)$ . We need to prove that

$$(-1)^{N+1}C(2N-2; 1, 1; 0; 0, 0) > 0, \quad N \geq 2. \quad (4.23)$$

Writing for simplicity  $C(k; r, s) = C(k; r, s; 0; 0, 0)$ , it follows from (2.36a) that

$$\begin{aligned} & C(2N-4; 0, 0)C(2N-2; 1, 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}C(2N-2; 0, 0)C(2N-4; 1, 1) - C(2N-3; 1, 0)C(2N-3; 0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

By (4.12), (4.15) and (4.19),

$$\begin{aligned} C(2N; 0, 0) &= 2^{N(N-1)}, \\ C(2N-1; 1, 0) &= (-1)^{N+1}2^{(N-1)(N-2)}N, \\ C(2N-1; 0, 1) &= 2^{(N-1)(N-2)}N. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $C_N = C(2N-2; 1, 1; 0; 0, 0)$  satisfies the recursion

$$C_N = 4^{N-3}C_{N-1} + (-1)^{N+1}2^{(N-2)(N-3)}(N-1)^2.$$

Starting from  $C_1 = 0$ , we find that  $C_N = (-1)^{N+1}2^{N^2-5N+5}N(N-1)$ , in agreement with (4.23).

**Case 12:**  $k \geq 2$ ,  $(r, s, t, u) = (0, 0, 1, 1)$ . This case is similar to Case 11, except that we start from (2.36c) rather than (2.36a). We find that  $C_N = C(2N-2; 0, 0; 0; 1, 1)$  satisfies

$$C_N = 4^{N-3}C_{N-1} + (-1)^N2^{(N-2)(N-3)}.$$

Starting from  $C_1 = -2$ , the solution is  $C_N = (-1)^N2^{N^2-5N+5}$ , which completes the proof in this case.

**Case 13:**  $k \geq 2$ ,  $(r, s, t, u) = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ . Using (2.36b), one finds as above that  $C_N = C(2N-2; 1, 0; 0; 0, 1)$  satisfies

$$C_N = 4^{N-3}C_{N-1} + (-1)^{N+1}2^{(N-2)(N-3)}(N-1).$$

With  $C_1 = 1$ , the solution is  $C_N = (-1)^{N+1}2^{(N-1)(N-4)}(2N-1)$ .

We now turn to cases with  $k \geq 2$  and  $l+n \geq k+2$ . Since  $m = 0$ , the latter inequality is equivalent to  $l+n \geq N+1$ . By (4.14), we then have either  $\min(l, n) \geq 1$  or  $(k, l, m, n) = (N-1, 0, 0, N+1)$ . The latter case is included in Case 5.

**Case 14:**  $l+n \geq k+2 \geq 4$ ,  $\min(l, n) \geq 1$ . By (4.13), we may assume  $s = t = 0$ . With  $C(k, l, n) = C(k; l, 0; 0; 0, n)$ , we must prove that

$$(-1)^{[N/2]+k+(n+1)N}C(k, l, n) > 0. \quad (4.24)$$

Using (2.36b), we find the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} & C(k, l, n)C(k-2, l-1, n-1) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}C(k-2, l, n)C(k, l-1, n-1) + C(k-1, l, n-1)C(k-1, l-1, n). \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Since we assume that we are not in Case 5, we have strict inequality in (4.6), that is,  $l < N$  and  $n < N + 1$ . Then, all instances of  $C(k, l, n)$  in (4.25) satisfy (4.14) and  $l + n \geq k$ . One may check that the lemma states that (4.24) holds in this larger parameter domain. The inequality (4.24) then follows by induction.

The only remaining cases are those with  $(k, m) = (0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$ , or  $(0, 1)$ . When  $(k, m) = (1, 0)$ , (4.6) can be expressed as  $(N - n - 1)(N + 1 - n) \leq 0$ , which gives three possibilities:  $(l, n) = (N, N - 1)$ ,  $(N - 1, N)$  or  $(N - 2, N + 1)$ . Similarly,  $(k, m) = (0, 0)$  gives  $(l, n) = (N, N)$  or  $(N - 1, N + 1)$  and  $(k, m) = (0, 1)$  gives  $(l, n) = (N - 1, N)$ . We are then in Case 5, except when  $(k, l, m, n) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 1, 0, 0)$ ,  $(0, 0, 1, 1)$  or  $(1, N - 1, 0, N)$ . The first two cases are included in Case 6 and 7, respectively. For the third case, by (4.13), it is enough to compute  $C(0; 0, 0; 1; 0, 1) = 4$ . Thus, only the last case remains.

**Case 15:**  $(k, l, m, n) = (1, N - 1, 0, N)$ . By (4.13),  $(r, s, t, u) = (N - 1, 0, 0, N)$ . The case  $N = 1$  is included in Case 8. We also check the case  $N = 2$ , when  $C(1; 1, 0; 0; 0, 2) = 3/4$ . When  $N \geq 3$ , it follows from (2.36c) that

$$\begin{aligned} C(1; N - 1, 0; 0; 0, N) C(1; N - 3, 0; 0; 0, N - 2) \\ = \frac{1}{4} \left( C(1; N - 1, 0; 0; 0, N - 2) C(1; N - 3, 0; 0; 0, N) \right. \\ \left. - C(1; N - 2, 0; 0; 0, N - 1)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Using (4.8), then repeatedly (4.10) and finally (4.18), we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} C(1; N - 1, 0; 0; 0, N - 2) &= \frac{1}{2^{2(N-1)(N-2)}} C(N - 1; 1, 0; N - 2; 0, 0) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{[N/2]+1}}{2^{(N-1)(N-2)}} C(1; 1, 0; 0; 0, 0) = \frac{(-1)^{[N/2]+1}}{2^{(N-1)(N-2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using also (4.11),

$$\begin{aligned} C(1; N - 3, 0; 0; 0, N) &= \frac{1}{2^{2(N-1)(N-2)}} C(N - 3; 0, 1; N; 0, 0) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{[N/2]+1}}{2^{N^2-3N+4}} C(0; 0, 1; 3; 0, 0) = \frac{(-1)^{[N/2]+1}}{2^{N(N-3)}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can then write (4.26) as

$$C_N C_{N-2} = \frac{1}{4^{(N-1)(N-2)}} - \frac{1}{4} C_{N-2}^2,$$

where  $C_N = C(1; N - 1, 0; 0; 0, N)$ . With initial values  $C_1 = -1$ ,  $C_2 = 3/4$ , the solution is

$$C_N = (-1)^{[N/2]+1} 2^{-N(N-1)} (2N - 1).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2.

The proof also gives the following sharper form of Lemma 4.1.

**Corollary 4.3.** *The maximal power of  $\zeta$  that divides (4.4) is  $\zeta^{\max(M, M')}$ , with  $M$  as in (4.3) and  $M'$  as in (4.7).*

Lemma 4.2 implies the following result on the polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$ .

**Corollary 4.4.** *If  $k_1 + k_2 \leq n$ , then, as  $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ ,*

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\zeta^L + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^{L+1}),$$

where  $L = (k_1 + k_2)(2n - k_1 - k_2 - 1)$ . Moreover,  $C(1, \dots, 1) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* In (2.37), the denominator behaves as  $\zeta^{2K}$ , with

$$K = (k_0^+ + k_3^+ + m)(k_1^- + k_2^-) + (k_0^- + k_3^-)(k_1^+ + k_2^+) + (k_1^+ + k_2^+)(k_1^- + k_2^-).$$

The numerator is an instance of (4.4) with

$$(k, l, m, n, N) \mapsto (m + k_0^+ + k_3^+, k_1^+ + k_2^+, k_0^- + k_3^-, k_1^- + k_2^-, n + |\mathbf{k}^-|).$$

Under these replacements, the quantity (4.3) is equal to  $K + L$ . Thus, Lemma 4.1 implies that  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  is divisible by  $\zeta^L$ . Under the same replacements,  $(N - l - m)(N + 1 - m - n) = (n + 1)(n - k_1 - k_2)$ . Thus, for  $k_1 + k_2 \leq n$ , the non-vanishing of  $C(1, \dots, 1)$  follows from Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

If  $m = 0$ , we can avoid the condition  $k_1 + k_2 \leq n$ .

**Corollary 4.5.** *For  $m = 0$ ,*

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})} = C\zeta^L + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^{L+1})$$

as  $\zeta \rightarrow 0$ , where  $C \neq 0$  and

$$L = (k_1 + k_2)(2n - k_1 - k_2 - 1) + (n + 1) \max(0, k_1 + k_2 - n).$$

*Proof.* If  $k_1 + k_2 \leq n$ , this is a special case of Corollary 4.4. Else, it can be reduced to Corollary 4.4 by the symmetry (2.50).  $\square$

When  $m > 0$  and  $k_1 + k_2 > n$ , application of (2.50) leads to  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(\zeta x_1, \dots, \zeta x_m)$ , whose behaviour at  $\zeta = 0$  is not covered by Lemma 4.2. Though it may be possible to find a generalization that includes that function, it seems that with our approach the number of cases to consider would be much increased. Thus, we are content with presenting the general case as a conjecture.

**Conjecture 4.6.** *In general,*

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\zeta^L + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^{L+1}),$$

where

$$L = (k_1 + k_2)(2n - k_1 - k_2 - 1) + (n + 1 - m) \max(k_1 + k_2 - n, 0)$$

and  $C$  does not vanish identically.

In §3 and §4, we have investigated the behaviour of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  at  $\zeta = -2$  and  $\zeta = 0$ , which are two of the six cusps of  $\Gamma_0(12)$ . The behaviour at the other four cusps follows using the symmetries of Corollary 2.18. We will state this in detail for the case  $m = 0$ .

**Proposition 4.7.** *When  $m = 0$ , we can write*

$$T_n^{(\mathbf{k})} = (2\zeta + 1)^{\delta(k_0+k_2-1)} (\zeta - 1)^{\delta(k_2+k_3-1)} \left( \frac{\zeta}{2} + 1 \right)^{\delta(k_1+k_2-1)-(k_1+k_2)(n-1)} \\ \times (\zeta + 1)^{\lambda(k_0+k_1)} \zeta^{\lambda(k_1+k_2)} p(\zeta), \quad (4.27)$$

where  $\delta(x) = \lfloor x^2/4 \rfloor$ ,

$$\lambda(x) = x(2n - x - 1) + (n + 1) \max(0, x - n),$$

and  $p$  is a polynomial of degree

$$D = (n - 1)(2n + k_0 + k_1 + 2k_2) - \delta(k_0 + k_2 - 1) - \delta(k_1 + k_2 - 1) - \delta(k_2 + k_3 - 1) \\ - \lambda(k_0 + k_1) - \lambda(k_0 + k_2) - \lambda(k_1 + k_2),$$

which does not vanish at  $\zeta = -1/2$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ ,  $\zeta = -2$ ,  $\zeta = -1$  or  $\zeta = 0$ .

*Proof.* Defining  $p$  by (4.27), it follows from (3.18) and the considerations of §3.3 that  $p(-2)$  is finite and non-zero. By Corollary 4.5, the same holds for  $p(0)$ . Using Corollary 2.18, we deduce that  $p(-1/2)$ ,  $p(1)$ ,  $p(-1)$  and  $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} \zeta^{-D} p(\zeta)$  are all finite and non-zero. It remains to prove that  $p$  has no poles outside the set  $P = \{-1/2, 1, -2, -1, 0\}$ . This is clear from (2.37). Indeed, poles can appear only at the point  $\zeta = -2$ , which is a pole of  $\xi_1$  and  $\xi_2$ , or at the zeroes of  $G(\xi_i, \xi_j)$ , which are the other four points in  $P$ .  $\square$

## 5. COMPARISON OF NOTATION

In this Section, we explain how  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$  are related to various polynomials appearing in [BM1, BM2, BM3, BH, FH, H, R3, RS, Z2].

**5.1. Polynomials related to three-colour model.** In [R3], we worked with symmetric polynomials in  $2n + 1$  variables, defined by

$$S_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n, z) \\ = \frac{\prod_{i,j=1}^n G(x_i, y_j)}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i)(y_j - y_i)} \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( \frac{F(x_i, y_j, z)}{G(x_i, y_j)} \right), \quad (5.1)$$

where  $G$  is as in (2.21) and

$$F(x, y, z) = (\zeta + 2)xyz - \zeta(xy + yz + xz + x + y + z) + \zeta(2\zeta + 1).$$

Since  $F(x, y, 1) = 2(x - \zeta)(y - \zeta)$ , it follows that

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}) = \frac{1}{2^n \prod_{j=1}^{2n} (x_j - \zeta)} S_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, 1).$$

On the other hand, letting  $y_n \rightarrow 1$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow \zeta$  in (5.1) one easily derives

$$\lim_{x_{2n} \rightarrow \zeta} \frac{S_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}, 1)}{\prod_{j=1}^{2n} (x_j - \zeta)} = 2^n (\zeta(\zeta + 1))^{n-1} S_{n-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{2n-1}).$$

Combining this with Lemma 2.16 gives

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2n+1}) &= \frac{1}{(\zeta(\zeta + 1))^n} T_{n+1}^{(0,0,0,0)}(x_1, \dots, x_{2n+1}, \zeta) \\ &= \frac{2^n \prod_{j=1}^{2n+1} (x_j - \zeta)}{1 - \zeta} T_n^{(0,0,0,-1)}(x_1, \dots, x_{2n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Using (5.2), we can rewrite the polynomials  $P_n$ ,  $p_n$ ,  $y_n$  and  $\tilde{p}_n$  of [R3, Prop. 8.1] in terms of  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$ . Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n(x, \zeta) &= \frac{(-1)^{[n/2]} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} + 1\right)^{n(n-1)-\delta(n-1)} (x - \zeta)}{(1 - \zeta) \zeta^{n(n-1)} (\zeta + 1)^{n(n-2)} (2\zeta + 1)^{\delta(n-1)}} T_n^{(n,n,0,-1)}(x) \\ p_n(\zeta) &= \frac{(-1)^{[n/2]} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} + 1\right)^{n(n-1)-\delta(n-1)}}{(1 - \zeta) \zeta^{n(n-1)} (\zeta + 1)^{n^2-2n-1} (2\zeta + 1)^{\delta(n)}} T_n^{(n+1,n,0,-1)}, \\ y_n(\zeta) &= \frac{(-1)^{[n/2]} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} + 1\right)^{(n-1)^2-\delta(n-2)}}{2^{[(n+3)/2]} (1 - \zeta) \zeta^{n(n-1)} (\zeta + 1)^{n^2-2n-1} (2\zeta + 1)^{\delta(n+1)}} T_n^{(n+2,n-1,0,-1)} \\ \tilde{p}_n(\zeta) &= \frac{(-1)^{[n/2]+1} 2^{[(n-1)/2]} \left(\frac{\zeta}{2} + 1\right)^{n^2-1-\delta(n)}}{(1 - \zeta) \zeta^{n^2-1} (\zeta + 1)^{n^2-2n-1} (2\zeta + 1)^{\delta(n-1)}} T_n^{(n,n+1,0,-1)} \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

The main result of [R3] is that the partition function of the three-colour model with domain wall boundary conditions can be expressed in terms of  $p_n$  and  $\tilde{p}_n$ .

**5.2. Polynomials of Bazhanov and Mangazeev.** We will now consider the polynomials  $\mathcal{P}_n(x, z)$  of Bazhanov and Mangazeev [BM1, BM2, BM3], which describe the ground state eigenvalue of Baxter's  $Q$ -operator for the supersymmetric ( $\Delta = -1/2$ ) eight-vertex model. In [BM1], these polynomials are defined up to a factor independent of  $x$ , and then normalized by writing

$$\mathcal{P}_n(x, z) = \sum_{k=0}^n r_k^{(n)}(z) x^k,$$

and requiring that  $r_n^{(n)}(0) = 1$ . Since this only determines  $\mathcal{P}_n(x, z)$  up to a multiplicative factor  $f(z)$  with  $f(0) = 1$ , we make the definition precise by requiring in addition that  $\mathcal{P}_n(x, z)$  is not divisible by any non-constant polynomial in  $z$ . This allows us to relate them to the polynomials  $P_n$  from [R3].

**Proposition 5.1.** *The polynomials  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and  $P_n$  are related by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_n \left( y, \frac{\zeta}{(\zeta+2)(2\zeta+1)} \right) &= \left( \frac{2}{(\zeta+2)(2\zeta+1)} \right)^{\delta(n)} \left( \frac{\zeta y + \zeta + 2}{\zeta(\zeta+1)} \right)^n \\ &\quad \times P_n \left( \frac{\zeta(y+2\zeta+1)}{\zeta y + \zeta + 2}, \zeta \right). \end{aligned}$$

We will prove Proposition 5.1 in §5.4 (using a result from [R4]).

Bazhanov and Mangazeev introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} s_n(z) &= r_n^{(n)}(z) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{P}_n(x, z)}{x^n}, \\ \bar{s}_n(z) &= r_n^{(0)}(z) = \mathcal{P}_n(0, z). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Proposition 5.1 and (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{(\zeta+2)(2\zeta+1)}{2} \right)^{\delta(n)} s_n \left( \frac{\zeta}{(\zeta+2)(2\zeta+1)} \right) &= \frac{(-1)^{[n/2]} \left( \frac{\zeta}{2} + 1 \right)^{n(n-1)-\delta(n-1)}}{\zeta^{n(n-1)} (\zeta+1)^{n(n-1)} (2\zeta+1)^{\delta(n-1)}} T_n^{(n,n,0,0)}, \\ \left( \frac{(\zeta+2)(2\zeta+1)}{2} \right)^{\delta(n)} \bar{s}_n \left( \frac{\zeta}{(\zeta+2)(2\zeta+1)} \right) &= \frac{(-1)^{[n/2]+1} 2^{n-1} \left( \frac{\zeta}{2} + 1 \right)^{n^2-1-\delta(n-1)}}{\zeta^{n^2-1} (\zeta+1)^{n(n-1)} (2\zeta+1)^{\delta(n-1)}} T_n^{(n,n,1,-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

**5.3. Polynomials of Zinn-Justin.** In [BM3], Bazhanov and Mangazeev gave a number of conjectures for eigenvectors of the supersymmetric XYZ Hamiltonian on a periodic chain of odd length. These involve polynomials  $p_n$  (not to be confused with the polynomials  $p_n$  of §5.1) and  $q_n$ , indexed by  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which can conjecturally be used to factorize the polynomials  $s_n$  and  $\bar{s}_n$ . For instance, for  $n \geq 0$  it is conjectured that

$$s_{2n+1}(y^2) = p_n(y)p_n(-y). \quad (5.4)$$

Zinn-Justin [Z2] expressed  $p_n$  and  $q_n$  in terms of the symmetric polynomials

$$H_{2n}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n) = \frac{\prod_{i,j=1}^n h(x_i, y_j)}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_j - x_i)(y_j - y_i)} \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left( \frac{1}{h(x_i, y_j)} \right),$$

where

$$h(x, y) = 1 - (3 + \zeta_Z^2)xy + (1 - \zeta_Z^2)xy(x + y)$$

and  $\zeta_Z$  is a parameter (with a subscript to distinguish it from our  $\zeta$ ). To see the connection to (2.27), we observe that

$$G(\phi(x), \phi(y)) = \frac{2\zeta^2(\zeta+1)^2}{(\zeta+2)^2} h(x, y),$$

where

$$\phi(x) = \frac{\zeta}{\zeta+2} (1 - 2(\zeta+1)x)$$

and the parameters in  $G$  and  $h$  are related by

$$\zeta_Z = 2\zeta + 1. \quad (5.5)$$

With this relation between the parameters, it follows that

$$T_n(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_{2n})) = \left( \frac{\zeta(\zeta+1)}{\zeta+2} \right)^{n(n-1)} H_{2n}(x_1, \dots, x_{2n}).$$

Using identities from [Z2, §4.1] (where the factor  $\zeta^{2m(m-1)}$  should be replaced throughout by  $\zeta^{m(m-1)}$ ) we can now write

$$p_n \left( \frac{1}{2\zeta+1} \right) = \frac{(-1)^n C_n (\zeta+2)^{n^2-n-1}}{\zeta^{n^2-2n-1} (\zeta+1)^{n(n-1)} (2\zeta+1)^{n^2+n+1}} T_n^{(-1, 2n+1, 0, 0)},$$

where  $C_n = 2^n$  for  $n \geq 0$  and  $C_n = 3^{n+1}/2^{n+2}$  for  $n \leq -1$ . To be precise, for  $n \geq 0$ , this follows immediately from a corresponding identity in [Z2], while for  $n \leq -1$  we also need to apply Corollary 2.22. The reason for the different behaviour of  $C_n$  for small and large  $n$  is simply that the normalization chosen in [BM3] is not quite natural from our present perspective. Similarly,

$$q_n \left( \frac{1}{2\zeta+1} \right) = D_n \left( \frac{\zeta+2}{\zeta(\zeta+1)(2\zeta+1)} \right)^{n(n+1)} T_{n+1}^{(0, 2n+2, 0, 0)},$$

where  $D_n = 1$  for  $n \geq -1$  and  $D_n = 3^{n+2}/2^{2n+3}$  for  $n \leq -2$ .

The identity (5.4), and related conjectures from [BM3], can thus be expressed in terms of the polynomials  $T_n^{(\mathbf{k})}$ . We hope to return to these conjectures in a subsequent paper in the present series.

**5.4. Proof of Proposition 5.1.** The starting point of [BM1] is Baxter's TQ-equation for the eight-vertex model, which has the form

$$T(u)Q(u) = \phi(u-\eta)Q(u+2\eta) + \phi(u+\eta)Q(u-2\eta). \quad (5.6)$$

Here,  $T$  and  $Q$  are eigenvalues of the transfer matrix and  $Q$ -operator, respectively,  $\phi(u) = \vartheta_1(u|q)^N$  in the classical notation of [WW], and  $u, q = \exp(\pi i \tau_{\text{BM}})$  and  $\eta$  are parameters of the model (we use the subscript BM to distinguish parameters used in [BM1] from ours). In the case  $\eta = \pi/3$ ,  $N = 2n+1$ , the ground state eigenvalue has the simple form  $T(u) = \phi(u)$ . In this case, let

$$f(u) = \phi(u)(Q_+(u) + Q_-(u)),$$

where  $Q_+$  and  $Q_-$  are the two solutions to (5.6) defined in [BM1]. Rewriting the defining properties of these solutions, it is straight-forward to check that if

$$\tau_{\text{BM}} = 2\tau, \quad u = 2\pi \left( z + \frac{\tau + 1}{2} \right)$$

(so that  $q = p^2$ ), then the function

$$g(z) = \frac{e^{6\pi i(n+1)z} f(u)}{\theta(-e^{6\pi iz}; p^6)}$$

is an element of  $\Theta_n^{(0,n,n,-1)}$ .

In place of our uniformizing variables  $(x, \zeta)$ , Bazhanov and Mangazeev use  $(x_{\text{BM}}, z_{\text{BM}})$ , which in our notation are given by

$$x_{\text{BM}} = -\frac{\theta(\omega; p^2)^2 \theta(e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)}{\theta(-\omega; p^2)^2 \theta(-e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)}, \quad z_{\text{BM}} = \left( \frac{\theta(\omega; p^2)}{\theta(-\omega; p^2)} \right)^4.$$

Using (2.16) and [R3, Lemma 9.1], one may check that

$$x_{\text{BM}} = \frac{(1 - \zeta)(x - 2\zeta - 1)}{(1 + \zeta)(x - 1)}, \quad z_{\text{BM}} = \frac{1 + \zeta}{(1 - \zeta)(1 + 2\zeta)}.$$

Rewriting [BM1, Eq. (25)] in our notation gives

$$g(z) \sim e^{-2\pi iz} \theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2) \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{3n-2} \frac{(x - \xi_1)^n (x - \xi_2)^n (x - \xi_3)^{n-1}}{x - \eta_3} \\ \times P_n(x_{\text{BM}}, z_{\text{BM}}),$$

up to factors independent of  $z$ . On the other hand, by Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.14,

$$g(z) \sim e^{-2\pi iz} \theta(e^{4\pi iz}; p^2) \theta(\omega p e^{\pm 2\pi iz}; p^2)^{3n-2} \frac{(x - \xi_1)^n (x - \xi_2)^n}{x - \xi_3} T_n^{(0,n,n,-1)}(x).$$

It follows that

$$T_n^{(0,n,n,-1)}(x) \sim \frac{(x - 1)^n}{x - \zeta} \mathcal{P}_n \left( \frac{(1 - \zeta)(x - 2\zeta - 1)}{(1 + \zeta)(x - 1)}, \frac{1 + \zeta}{(1 - \zeta)(1 + 2\zeta)} \right) \quad (5.7)$$

up to a factor independent of  $x$ .

Next we observe that, by Corollary 2.18,

$$T_n^{(n,n,0,-1)}(x; \zeta) \sim T_n^{(0,n,n,-1)} \left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)x - (1 + 2\zeta)}{1 - \zeta}; -\zeta - 1 \right).$$

Combining this with (5.3) and (5.7), we find that

$$\left( \frac{y\zeta + \zeta + 2}{\zeta(\zeta + 1)} \right)^n P_n \left( \frac{\zeta(y + 2\zeta + 1)}{y\zeta + \zeta + 2}, \zeta \right) \\ = f(\zeta) \left( \frac{(\zeta + 2)(2\zeta + 1)}{2} \right)^{\delta(n)} \mathcal{P}_n \left( y, \frac{\zeta}{(\zeta + 2)(2\zeta + 1)} \right), \quad (5.8)$$

where it remains to show that  $f \equiv 1$ .

To proceed, we need the following result.

**Lemma 5.2.** *The polynomial  $P_n(x, \zeta)$  is not divisible by any non-constant polynomial in  $\zeta$ .*

*Proof.* As we will prove in [R4],  $P_n$  satisfies a differential equation of the form

$$\left( a(x, \zeta) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{b(x, \zeta)}{x} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{c(x, \zeta)}{x} + d(\zeta) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \right) P_n(x, \zeta) = 0, \quad (5.9)$$

where  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are explicit polynomials and

$$d(\zeta) = (\zeta - 1)\zeta(\zeta + 1)(\zeta + 2)(2\zeta + 1).$$

If  $P_n$  were divisible by some non-constant polynomial in  $\zeta$ , then we could write  $P_n(x, \zeta) = (\zeta - \zeta_0)^N Q(x, \zeta)$ , where  $N > 0$  and  $Q(x, \zeta_0) \neq 0$ . Inserting this into (5.9) gives  $d(\zeta_0) = 0$ . But at the five zeroes of  $d$ , it follows from [R3, Prop. 8.8] that  $P_n(x, \zeta_0) \neq 0$ .  $\square$

The differential equation (5.9) was conjectured in [BM3]. By Proposition 5.1, it is in fact equivalent to the differential equation for  $\mathcal{P}_n$  given without a rigorous proof in [BM1].

Let us now return to the function  $f$  in (5.8). It is clear that  $f$  can have poles only at the points  $\zeta = 0$ ,  $\zeta = -1$ ,  $\zeta = -2$  and  $\zeta = -1/2$ . Indeed, if  $\zeta_0$  is any other pole, then  $\mathcal{P}_n(y, z)$  would be divisible by  $y - \zeta_0/(\zeta_0 + 2)(2\zeta_0 + 1)$ , which contradicts our definition of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Similarly, by Lemma 5.2 and the fact that  $\zeta(y + 2\zeta + 1)/(y\zeta + \zeta + 2)$  is independent of  $y$  only for  $\zeta = 0$  and  $\zeta = 1$ ,  $f$  can have zeroes only at the points  $\zeta = 0$ ,  $\zeta = 1$ ,  $\zeta = -2$  and  $\zeta = -1/2$ . Moreover, by [R3, Eq. (8.4)] (or by (2.48a)),  $f(\zeta) = f(1/\zeta)$ . We conclude that  $f$  has the form

$$f(\zeta) = \frac{((\zeta + 2)(2\zeta + 1))^k (\zeta + 1)^{2l} (\zeta - 1)^{2m}}{\zeta^{k+l+m}}, \quad (5.10)$$

where  $k$ ,  $l$  and  $m$  are integers, with  $l \leq 0$  and  $m \geq 0$ .

It follows from [R3, Eq. (8.17)] that

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} f(\zeta) = \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\zeta^{2n} P_n(\zeta(y + 1)/2, \zeta)}{\zeta^n \mathcal{P}_n(y, 0)} = \frac{\sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n+m}{m} (y + 1)^{n-m}}{\mathcal{P}_n(y, 0)}.$$

We conclude that  $f$  is regular at 0 and, in view of the normalization of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , that  $f(0) = 1$ .

To prove that  $f$  is regular at  $\zeta = -1$ , we need to prove that

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow -1} \frac{1}{(\zeta + 1)^n} P_n(1 + y(\zeta + 1), \zeta)$$

exists finitely. Expressing  $P_n$  in terms of  $T_n^{(0, n, n, -1)}$ , this is equivalent to the finiteness of

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\zeta^{n(n+3)}} T \left( 1 + y\zeta, \xi_1^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}; 1 \right),$$

which follows from Corollary 4.3.

Finally, to see that  $f(1) \neq 0$ , we must verify that  $P_n(1, 1) \neq 0$ . However, by [R3, Prop. 8.8],  $P_n(1, 1)$  is a non-zero constant times  $\phi_n(-1/3)$ , where  $\phi_n$  is as in (3.21). The non-vanishing of  $\phi_n(-1/3)$  follows recursively from (3.24).

By the above considerations,  $k = l = m = 0$  in (5.10). Since we have also showed that  $f(0) = 1$ ,  $f$  is identically 1. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.1.

## REFERENCES

- [AL] A. O. L. Atkin and J. Lehner, *Hecke operators on  $\Gamma_0(n)$* , Math. Ann. 185 (1970), 134–160.
- [B1] R. J. Baxter, *One-dimensional anisotropic Heisenberg chain*, Ann. Phys. 70 (1972), 323–337.
- [B2] R. J. Baxter, *Eight-vertex model in lattice statistics and one-dimensional anisotropic Heisenberg chain II. Equivalence to a generalized ice-type model*, Ann. Phys. 76 (1973), 25–47.
- [BM1] V. V. Bazhanov and V. V. Mangazeev, *Eight-vertex model and non-stationary Lamé equation*, J. Phys. A 38 (2005), L145–L153.
- [BM2] V. V. Bazhanov and V. V. Mangazeev, *The eight-vertex model and Painlevé VI*, J. Phys. A 39 (2006), 12235–12243.
- [BM3] V. V. Bazhanov and V. V. Mangazeev, *Eight-vertex model and Painlevé VI equation. II. Eigenvector results*, J. Phys. A 43 (2010), 085206.
- [BH] M. Beccaria and C. Hagendorf, *A staggered fermion chain with supersymmetry on open intervals*, J. Phys. A 45 (2012), 365201.
- [FH] P. Fendley and C. Hagendorf, *Ground-state properties of a supersymmetric fermion chain*, J. Stat. Mech. 2011 (2011), P02014.
- [FS] P. Fendley and H. Saleur,  *$N = 2$  supersymmetry, Painlevé III and exact scaling functions in 2D polymers*, Nuclear Phys. B 388 (1992), 609–626.
- [F] G. Filali, *Elliptic dynamical reflection algebra and partition function of SOS model with reflecting end*, J. Geom. Phys. 61 (2011), 1789–1796.
- [Fo] O. Forster, *Lectures on Riemann Surfaces*, Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [FuH] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [H] C. Hagendorf, *Spin chains with dynamical lattice supersymmetry*, J. Stat. Phys. 150 (2013), 609–657.
- [HF] C. Hagendorf and P. Fendley, *The eight-vertex model and lattice supersymmetry*, J. Stat. Phys. 146 (2012), 1122–1155.
- [K] C. Krattenthaler, *Advanced determinant calculus*, Sémin. Lothar. Combin. 42 (1999), B42q.
- [Ku] G. Kuperberg, *Another proof of the alternating-sign matrix conjecture*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices 1996 (1996), 139–150.
- [L] A. Lascoux, *Pfaffians and representations of the symmetric group*, Acta Math. Sin. 25 (2009), 1929–1950.
- [M] R. S. Maier, *On rationally parametrized modular equations*, J. Ramanujan Math. Soc. 24 (2009), 1–73.
- [O] S. Okada, *Applications of minor summation formulas to rectangular-shaped representations of classical groups*, J. Algebra 205 (1998), 337–367.
- [RS] A. V. Razumov and Yu. G. Stroganov, *A possible combinatorial point for the XYZ spin chain*, Theor. Math. Phys. 164 (2010), 977–991.
- [R1] H. Rosengren, *Multivariable Christoffel–Darboux kernels and characteristic polynomials of random Hermitian matrices*, SIGMA 2 (2006), 085.
- [R2] H. Rosengren, *An Izergin–Korepin-type identity for the 8VSOS model, with applications to alternating sign matrices*, Adv. Appl. Math. 43 (2009), 137–155.
- [R3] H. Rosengren, *The three-colour model with domain wall boundary conditions*, Adv. Appl. Math. 46 (2011), 481–535.
- [R4] H. Rosengren, *Symmetric polynomials related to the supersymmetric eight-vertex model. II. Schrödinger equation*, in preparation.
- [R5] H. Rosengren, *Symmetric polynomials related to the supersymmetric eight-vertex model. III. Painlevé VI equation*, in preparation.
- [RSc] H. Rosengren and M. Schlosser, *Elliptic determinant evaluations and the Macdonald identities for affine root systems*, Compositio Math. 142 (2006), 937–961.
- [S] G. Shimura, *Introduction to the Arithmetic Theory of Automorphic Functions*, Princeton University Press, 1971.
- [T] O. Tsuchiya, *Determinant formula for the six-vertex model with reflecting end*, J. Math. Phys. 39 (1998), 5946–5951.

- [W] G. N. Watson, *Theorem stated by Ramanujan. VII: Theorems on continued fractions*, J. London Math. Soc. 4 (1929), 39–48.
- [WW] E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson, *A Course on Modern Analysis*, 4th ed., Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- [Z1] P. Zinn-Justin, *Six-Vertex, Loop and Tiling Models: Integrability and Combinatorics*, Habilitation Thesis, Paris, 2008, arXiv:0901.0665.
- [Z2] P. Zinn-Justin, *Sum rule for the eight-vertex model on its combinatorial line*, in *Symmetries, Integrable Systems and Representations*, 599–637, Springer-Verlag, 2013.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND UNIVERSITY OF  
GOTHENBURG, SE-412 96 GÖTEBORG, SWEDEN

*E-mail address:* `hjalmar@chalmers.se`

*URL:* `http://www.math.chalmers.se/~hjalmar`